

The Episcopate of

Daniel Murphy

First Archbishop of Hobart

1866-1907

by

Anthony Alan LeClerc

Hobart

1994

**Table of Contents.**

	Page
Declaration	3
Acknowledgments	4
Introduction	6
Biographical Details	8
Arrival in Hobart	15
Teaching of the Pastorals	19
Archbishop's Rule of the Diocese	27
Old Age and Death	48
Conclusion	53
Appendices	
I The Pastorals in Detail	56
II Summary of the Pastorals	82
III Literary Style	84
IV On Aborigines	87
V Opening of Vatican I	89
VI Plenary Council Pastoral	91
VII Pastoral 1907	95
Sources	97
Bibliography	98

This Thesis is presented in partial fulfilment  
of the requirements for  
the Degree of Master of Humanities  
at the University of Tasmania,  
Hobart,  
1994.

**Declaration**

This thesis contains no material which has  
been accepted for the award of any degree in  
a University, and to the best of my knowledge  
and belief, contains no copy or paraphrases of  
material previously published or written by  
another person except where due reference is  
made in the text of the thesis.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'A. A. LeClerc', written over a horizontal dotted line.

A. A. LeClerc

### Acknowledgments

The writing of this thesis would have been impossible without the ready permission and interest of His Grace, Dr Eric D'Arcy, the eighth Archbishop of Hobart, and ninth occupant of the See. I am very grateful also, to Father Denis Allen, Vicar-General, for his authorisation to explore the riches of the Catholic Archives of the Archdiocese. Father Terry Southerwood provided initial clues to the areas of interest, and has been interested and helpful throughout the research and writing periods.

These Archives are stored at the University of Tasmania, and the ready assistance of Mrs Gillian Blain, the Archivist, made possible access to this rich store of historical data. Mr Bob Broughton, her assistant, went far beyond the call of duty to facilitate and expedite my search. I am extremely grateful to them both. I can only hope that the richness of the store of materials in the University Archives comes to be more widely known to researchers and administrators.

The staff of the History Department of the University also deserve thanks in making this course so interesting that I persevered with it to this point, and enjoyed every minute of it. Dr Richard Ely was most helpful in the compilation of this work. Professor Austin Gough, a descendant of Joseph Roper, was very helpful in my coming to an understanding of the relationship between his ancestor and Dr Murphy. I am indebted to them all.

I am grateful also to the Presentation Sisters, who provided me with access to their Archives and an appreciation of the Archbishop as "Uncle Dan."

I also acknowledge the great assistance of my family in the completion of this work, in proof reading and in leaving me free to get on with the job.

Finally, I dedicate this work to the memory of the subject, the first Archbishop of Hobart, whom I have come to know, respect and admire for his service to his people, and the love of God that compelled him in that service.

AAL  
November, 1994.



---

### Introduction

Daniel Murphy was born on 15 <sup>1</sup> or 18 <sup>2</sup> June, 1815, the year of Waterloo, at Belmont, County Cork, Ireland. He was to die 92 years later at Low Head on the Tamar in Tasmania, the oldest prelate in Christendom. Thus his life spanned the age of sailing ships that could take twelve months for communication to and from Tasmania, and the age of powered flight as pioneered by the Wright Brothers.

In the Catholic Church, much also was changing. Murphy was born three-quarters of the way through the pontificate of Pius VII, who had negotiated with Napoleon the Concordat of 1801, in the year when the Papal States were returned to the Pope by the Congress of Vienna. He lived through seven pontificates, and saw and reacted strongly against the seizure of the Papal States from Pius IX, and was much affected by the "Prisoner of the Vatican" role adopted by his successors.

He was thus a Church leader during the days when the forces of Rationalism were plaguing the Church; the heresies of "indifferentism" and "infidelity" threatened church and society as he knew it; Vatican I was opened and sent scattering by the invading Italians; churches and church schools were supported by the government in the colony, and then lost that support; education over the whole continent became free and secular, and the struggle to erect religious schools began in earnest; political freedoms were spreading in the land, the franchise being extended, and federation was argued about and accomplished; labour was organising and the dignity of work was being established, in the face of Church suspicions of "secret societies"; and the Catholic Church in this continent was building a sense of an Australian Church in the family of world-wide Catholicism, linked strongly to the Papacy, defending its loyalty to the Empire, and increasingly bedevilled by the Irish Question.

Archbishop Murphy reacted to these events and this reaction permeated the Pastorals that he has left as his legacy to the Church in Tasmania. As well as attending Vatican I, he took part in an Australian Provincial Council, 1869; three Australian Plenary Councils, 1885,

---

<sup>1</sup> *Australian Dictionary of Biography*, Vol 5, Section Editors Bede Nairn, et al, MUP, 1974, p 316, afterwards referred to as *ADB*.

<sup>2</sup> Beechinor, Rev MJ, ['Father Michael'] *Memoir of Archbishop Murphy*, Tabart Bros, Launceston, 1916, p 12, afterwards referred to as *Memoir*.

1895, and 1905; and meetings of Australian Bishops, especially that for the Centenary of Settlement, 1888. The teachings of these are some part of the legacy also, as themes they treated were further expanded by the Bishop in his own writings. What is left to us in the archives of the Archdiocese of Hobart is a record of the official teaching of Dr Murphy, and some evidence of his administrative style. All personal material has been suppressed by the Archbishop himself, as his coadjutor and successor attests in a note scribbled on an envelope in the archives; "Archbishop Murphy destroyed many records. PD." This is confirmed by a note of Archbishop Simonds on a letter he received from a nephew in Ireland of Archbishop Murphy, requesting material on his uncle's life and times in Hobart. Simonds noted on the letter "Archbishop Murphy destroyed all records." <sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> CA 6/MUR 44, Letter from a "fond nephew" of Murphy to Archbishop Simonds.

### **Biographical Details of Archbishop Murphy.**

Daniel's father was Michael Murphy, and his mother, Mary, was descended from the McSwiney clan. <sup>4</sup> He was born in the valley of the River Bride, not far from "Clodagh Castle, the ancestral home of the McSwineys." Brian McSwiney, "the chieftain then (in 1598) in possession of the castle and of the allegiance of the McSwiney clan was the maternal ancestor of Archbishop Murphy." <sup>5</sup> Beechinor also tells us: "His early education was received under the paternal roof, . . . Later on he was sent to Mr Golding's school in the city of Cork." <sup>6</sup> These facts lead to the conclusion that his family was reasonably well off.

From here, Daniel proceeded to "the National College of Maynooth," <sup>7</sup> and there is nothing of his student life in the seminary that has survived his culling of the records. Even his nephew's biography is silent here. Both Beechinor and *The Australian Dictionary of Biography* agree that he was ordained priest on 6 June, 1838. "Dr Ullathorne visited Maynooth at Pentecost, 1837," appealing for priests for NSW. Daniel "volunteered to go. . . his Bishop refused permission." Next, "Dr Carew, Coadjutor to the Vicar Apostolic of Madras" appealed for priests for India. "Daniel was ordained priest on June 9, 1838, . . . responded to the call . . . with Dr Carew and a few priests set sail on the *Lady Flora* in October . . . 1838, and in January," 1839, "landed in Madras. His first mission was Hyderabad . . . and here he laboured for two years without seeing a brother Priest." <sup>8</sup> His priestly labours in this tropical mission are also unchronicled. During these seven years, little has survived to flesh out the bones of the biography. We can assume that he was an effective missionary, because at age 30 he was nominated by his Bishop, Dr Fennelly, Vicar-Apostolic of Madras, to replace Dr Carew as his coadjutor. Beechinor tells us that Daniel went to Rome to protest the appointment:- "All efforts of the young Priest to escape the burdens of the mitre were in vain. . . . for Pius IX . . . said to him, 'They have made

---

<sup>4</sup> ADB, Vol 5, p 316.

<sup>5</sup> Beechinor, *Memoir*, p 12.

<sup>6</sup> Beechinor, *Memoir*, p 12.

<sup>7</sup> Beechinor, *Memoir*, p 13.

<sup>8</sup> Beechinor, *Memoir*, pp 13-14.



you a young Bishop and me a young Pope; we must obey." <sup>9</sup> Daniel Murphy, now resigned to his elevation, went to Ireland. "On 11th October, 1846 the consecration took place in . . . (the) parochial church of Kinsale, where his brother was parish priest. The consecrating Bishop was Right Rev John Murphy, Bishop of Cork." <sup>10</sup>

One could wonder if the Bishop of Cork was related to the new Bishop. Murphy is a very common name in County Cork. Dr Murphy was consecrated as the first Vicar Apostolic of Hyderabad, as this area had been separated from Madras since his election. At his nomination to the Episcopate, Murphy was 30 years old, and the youngest Bishop in the Irish Church, <sup>11</sup> and possibly the Universal Church. If this supposition is true, then he shared this distinction with his later successor in the See of Hobart, Guilford Young, who was the youngest Bishop in the Church when consecrated auxiliary to Dr Thomas MacGuire of Canberra-Goulburn. The new Bishop returned to Rome, and was in the city for the burial of the heart of Daniel O'Connell in 1847. He "sang the High Mass" at the invitation of the Pope for this event. Again, Beechinor is sparing of detail of the Bishop's trip east, noting only that he arrived in the vicariate port at 9.00 am on 16 November 1847.

<sup>12</sup> Travelling by land, he then arrived in Hyderabad on 13 December.<sup>13</sup> Again, Beechinor gives no details of the Indian service of some 18 years or more in that area as its Bishop. He goes next to Murphy's illness, and his return to Ireland. Fortunately, Fr William Hall, Vicar-General of Hobart Town for the absent and very ill Bishop Willson, in his Lenten Pastoral for 1866, fills in this gap for the faithful, who are looking forward to welcoming the new coadjutor:-

. . . translated to the See of Hobart Town after 25 years of missionary labours in India, where he filled the responsible position of Bishop of Hyderabad. Dr Murphy . . . is a Cork man . . . He was consecrated Bishop of Hyderabad on 11th October, 1846, at Kinsale, where his brother, the late Very Rev Denis Murphy, was then Parish Priest. . . . At the time of his consecration he was 30 years of age and was the youngest Bishop of the Irish Church. . . . arduous duties . . . when he took possession of his See. . . there were no churches suitable. . . no residence for the Priests . . . no accommodation for the Bishop. When he left (the diocese) it

---

<sup>9</sup> Beechinor, *Memoir*, p 15.

<sup>10</sup> Beechinor, *Memoir*, p 15, and CA 6/MUR 16, Pastoral Letter the VG, Lent, 1866, p 7.

<sup>11</sup> CA 6/MUR 16 Pastoral Letter of the VG; Lent, 1866, p 7.

<sup>12</sup> Beechinor, *Memoir*, p 26.

<sup>13</sup> Beechinor, *Memoir*, p 28.

---

possessed numerous churches and a cathedral . . . one of the finest in India . . . several efficient schools . . . orphanage and asylum for the aged . . . left ample means to his successor . . . proved himself to be an able and energetic administrator . . . devoted missionary of the Church. 'With such prelates in its councils, we may anticipate a brilliant future for the Catholic Church in Australia.' (Quoted in the Pastoral without attribution.)

Dr Murphy, by this measure, must be accounted a successful missionary Bishop in India.

After all this work in the Indian climate - some 25 years in all - his health failed and he resigned the see, to return to Ireland in 1864. He was named Titular Bishop of Philadelphia. <sup>14</sup> Again Beechinor summarises this without the luxury of detail: "Bishop Murphy had now spent 25 years under the burning sun of India. During that long time he visited Rome four times, but his health was now failing, and Cardinal Barnabo reported this fact to Pius IX, . . . He therefore returned to Ireland . . ." <sup>15</sup> Beechinor is also silent on the period in Ireland.

In England, meanwhile, Dr Willson had arrived after suffering a paralysing stroke at sea on March 8, 1865. He was carried ashore in June and was unable to say mass again. He spent time trying to recover, and practising signing his name. He finally recovered to the extent of taking "slow walks around the town leaning on the arm " <sup>16</sup> of a companion. He had asked Rome for a coadjutor, and, on July 5th, he rejected two names of English priests suggested by Rome, and insisted that his successor be Irish, as the diocese was largely Irish in its priests and people. <sup>17</sup>

In August, the then Archbishop Paul Cullen of Dublin lobbied Rome on behalf of Daniel Murphy, pressing that he be appointed coadjutor to Willson. This leading Irish churchman, (who was to be made a Cardinal in 1866), <sup>18</sup> with "Patrick Moran, <sup>19</sup> (who was) his nephew and secretary, had the unlimited confidence of the papal administration, with whom

---

<sup>14</sup> Southerwood, WT, *The Convicts' Friend*, Stella Maris Books, George Town, Tas, 1989, p 373, afterwards referred to as *Con Friend*.

<sup>15</sup> Beechinor, *Memoir*, p 36.

<sup>16</sup> Southerwood, *Con Friend*, p 372.

<sup>17</sup> Southerwood, *Con Friend*, pp 370-1.

<sup>18</sup> O'Farrell, P, *The Catholic Church and Community*, 3rd Rev Ed, NSWU Press, Kensington, Aus, 1992, p 228, afterwards referred to as *CC&C*.

<sup>19</sup> Later, Archbishop of Sydney, 1884-1911, created Cardinal 1885. (O'Farrell, *CC&C*, p 237.)

they were most influential." <sup>20</sup> Both the Archbishop and his nephew had been very involved in colonial affairs, well supplied with information, much of which was inaccurate, even untrue, by a minority of dissident Irish priests against the interests of Archbishop Polding and Bishop Goold, the Irish Bishop of Melbourne. Speaking of two of these, Frs Bermingham and McAlroy, O'Farrell says "But they also demonstrated in New South Wales as well as in Victoria, to Polding's remorse and Goold's chagrin, their fractious unwillingness to accept authority, their brazen ambition to become bishops, and their astonishing lack of veracity and scruple." <sup>21</sup> Both Polding and Goold "deeply resented the interference of the Irish clergy and hierarchy" <sup>22</sup> in their affairs. From 1865, Cullen was instrumental in securing Australian sees for his "relatives, friends or proteges." <sup>23</sup> Such was the context in which Paul Cullen proposed Daniel Murphy as coadjutor to Dr Willson. How he was related to Archbishop Cullen in terms of the foregoing categories is not clear. Paul Cullen's bequest to the Australian Church included Bishops James Murray, Matthew Quinn (joining his brother James), Timothy O'Mahoney, William Lanigan and Daniel Murphy.

On 18 September, 1865, the Sacred Congregation agreed to nominate Murphy to the Pope. Meanwhile, Willson was too ill to travel to Rome as he had intended, to ensure input into the appointment. In early October, Dr Murphy wrote to Willson announcing that he had been appointed his coadjutor. He must have done this on the strength of a whisper from his patron, Cullen. He visited Bishop Willson on the 18 October, and remained with him for five days. On the 24th of that month he was formally appointed in a Consistory in Rome, Coadjutor Bishop of Hobart Town, with the right of succession, and news of this event was sent to him on 26th.<sup>24</sup>

Meanwhile, in the Australias, as Murphy was to come to call the colonies, Archbishop Polding had informed Rome that Dr Willson was unable to rule his diocese, and was

---

<sup>20</sup> O'Farrell, *CC&C*, p 115.

<sup>21</sup> O'Farrell, *CC&C*, p 115.

<sup>22</sup> O'Farrell, *CC&C*, p 128.

<sup>23</sup> O'Farrell, *CC&C*, p 128.

<sup>24</sup> Southerwood, *Con Friend*, pp 370-1.

unlikely to return to it. He approved Murphy's appointment as coadjutor Bishop of Hobart Town. <sup>25</sup> The old Archbishop found himself having to accept the tide of Irish appointees to his province. "Polding's preferences were . . . becoming irrelevant." <sup>26</sup>

On 14 November, Dr Murphy's appointment became effective. Ten days later, Dr Willson wrote to Rome, informing them that he had met his new coadjutor, and apologised that he had been unable to travel there for discussions on the appointment. In late November, Murphy again visited Willson, and the old Bishop was at that stage still hoping to return to Hobart with his coadjutor. He finally decided to remain in Nottingham towards the end of the year. <sup>27</sup> In the New Year, he sent Rome his resignation, and a titular see was requested for him. His resignation was accepted by Rome on 8 March, 1866, and he was translated "from Hobart to Rhodiopolis in partibus infidelium," on 22 June. This was just eight days before his death.

Meanwhile, his coadjutor had spent fifty days on the *Great Britain* travelling to Melbourne and had arrived in the diocese of Hobart Town on 27 April. <sup>28</sup> There had been some differences between Willson and Murphy at their first meeting. Dr Murphy had told the Bishop of his plans to take two priests - his nephews Michael and Daniel Beechinor - to the colony, along with six Presentation Sisters, including his sister, Mother Francis Xavier Murphy, and a niece, postulant Ellen Murphy, soon to be received into the order at Richmond on 22-7-1867 as Sister Francis Xavier. <sup>29</sup> Bishop Willson opposed this idea, and opinion is divided as to whether his objection centred upon the nephews (Cullen's view), or the Sisters (Southerwood's view). We do have a letter written to Murphy by Willson, dated 5 February, 1866:-

In a communication lately received from Dr Hempenstall, I learn from an extract of a letter lately sent by you to him of your intention to take out with you six nuns and priests. I am so strongly convinced of the inexpediency and impolicy of what you are proposing to do, that I should reproach myself with being wanting in my duty to

---

<sup>25</sup> Southerwood, *Con Friend*, p 372.

<sup>26</sup> O'Farrell, *CC&C*, p 128.

<sup>27</sup> Southerwood, *Con Friend*, pp 372-3.

<sup>28</sup> Beechinor, *Memoir*, p 36.

<sup>29</sup> Records of Early Presentation Sisters, Presentation Archives, Blackmans Bay, #5.

Your Lordship and to the interests of the Diocese of Hobarton, if I did not give expression to what I feel. You will, I am sure, be aware, that it gives us great pain thus to differ with you in so important a point, and the more so, as this question was discussed by us in Birmingham in the presence of Dr Ullathorne, on which occasion we seemed to be in perfect agreement of opinion.

I feel quite sure from my lengthened acquaintance with the Diocese of Hobarton and the social changes lately taken place there, that if the parties who are being taken out thither, cannot maintain themselves, very serious difficulties and embarrassments tending to the injury of religion will arise. Praying that you may be guided to do what is for the best. <sup>30</sup>

No reply has been found. The letter is dictated, and then signed by Willson, still the Bishop of Hobarton. Southerwood says he "... forced himself to sign his name - an almost illegible scrawl - to the letters he dictated." The result of his paralysis is very evident. Southerwood thinks that this letter was occasioned by his disapproval of Murphy's intention to take "the semi-contemplative Presentation Sisters to Tasmania. It seems that he was worried that they would find it hard to make a living there, although he had welcomed the Sisters of Charity as early as 1847." <sup>31</sup> Indeed, three Sisters of Charity, expelled from the Archdiocese of Sydney by the Vicar-General, Abbot Henry Gregory, when they rejected his desire to 'Benedictinise' their order, landed in Hobart Town 20 June, 1847. <sup>32</sup> These had experienced no difficulty in supporting themselves and were welcomed and much appreciated by Bishop Willson. Southerwood described the Presentation Sisters as "semi-contemplative", but this does not seem to be borne out by the later work of that Order in Tasmania. Perhaps this lends weight to Cullen's view, that Willson was concerned about the nephew priests accompanying their uncle to Tasmania. His comment on the disagreement is:-

At Nottingham, Dr Murphy discussed Tasmanian affairs with Bishop Willson . . . Bishop Willson advised his successor to bring Sisters of Charity and priests to the Hobart diocese. The Sisters of Charity already in Tasmania had several links with the Mother Congregation in Erie - so it was thought in Dublin. Hence a community of Sisters could not be made available at once. The Bishop (Murphy) then readily accepted the offer of Presentation Sisters. It was not easy to get volunteer priests at that time. A misunderstanding of the position has arisen because so many priests had left Tasmania. Dr Murphy did not show prudence in the selection which he made. No real evil resulted. (Emphasis in the original.) <sup>33</sup>

<sup>30</sup> CA 6/MUR 1, Letter of Dr Willson to Dr Murphy.

<sup>31</sup> Southerwood, *Con Friend*, pp 370-1.

<sup>32</sup> Southerwood, *Con Friend*, p 74.

<sup>33</sup> Cullen 'Shell Minute Book', p 22, [uncatalogued]

---

The point made here is that Bishop Willson had no objection to Sisters of Charity accompanying Dr Murphy. Cullen records the 'swap' to Presentation Sisters without comment. He dwells on the priest problem, accuses Murphy of some lack of prudence, and states somewhat ambiguously that "no real evil resulted." The young Father Cullen had arrived in the Archdiocese in 1911, and he worked in active ministry till 1956, mainly at St Joseph's, Hobart, and when he retired, continued as Vicar-General and chaplain to St Joseph's Orphanage. <sup>34</sup> Given that the Very Rev Dean, Monsignor Daniel Beechinor lived to 1923, <sup>35</sup> and the Very Rev Archdeacon Michael Beechinor lived till 1929, <sup>36</sup> and were still remembered and revered by many people for all of Cullen's ministry, perhaps this muting was politic!

---

<sup>34</sup> Facts provided by Fr Terry Southerwood, 1994.

<sup>35</sup> Cullen 'Shell Minute Book', p 22, [uncatalogued]

<sup>36</sup> Cullen 'Shell Minute Book', p 22, [uncatalogued]

---

**Arrival in Hobart**

There is disagreement as to the arrival date of Bishop Murphy in Hobart. Cullen gives it as 17 April, 1866,<sup>37</sup> and Beechinor, who accompanied the Bishop on the journey, has 27 April "when His Lordship first touched Tasmanian soil. The reception committee was introduced by Vicar-General Hall. . . On 3rd May, Feast of the Holy Cross, the Bishop was duly installed at the Pro-Cathedral, St Joseph's, and the 'Te Deum' chanted."<sup>38</sup> However, the Hobart *Mercury* of 28 April solves the problem by listing the Bishop and his chaplain in the passenger list of SS *Southern Cross*, which arrived on the 27th, and adds an account of the new Bishop's reception by Fr Hall and the people in St Joseph's. The same paper, in its edition of 4 May, recounts the ceremony of installation in St Joseph's, which occurred the day before. This corrects the dating in the *Australian Dictionary of Biography*, which had the installation on 6 May.<sup>39</sup> It is worth noting here that Beechinor's dates have been confirmed, over those of Cullen and the *Australian Dictionary of Biography*.

The arrival of Rev Daniel Beechinor with the Presentation Sisters meant that with the two Beechinors, there were 18 priests in the diocese when Dr Murphy began his work.<sup>40</sup> It appears that the Bishop was welcomed by the clergy of the diocese. There is no record of when the news of Bishop Willson's resignation became known in the colony, but it was accepted by Rome on March 22.<sup>41</sup> There is no hint that Bishop Murphy was received as the Coadjutor Bishop, and the ceremony of installation would have put him in full possession of the See. Again, the *Mercury* of 4 May, 1866, clarifies this point. It reports that the Rev Michael Beechinor, at the installation ceremony, read two Papal briefs. The first was of Dr Murphy's appointment as coadjutor to Dr Willson; the second announced the resignation of the first Bishop of Hobarton due to illness, the acceptance of this resignation by the Pope, and the elevation of Dr Murphy to the See "by right of

---

<sup>37</sup> Cullen 'Shell Minute Book', p 66, [uncatalogued]

<sup>38</sup> Beechinor, *Memoir*, p 36.

<sup>39</sup> ADG, Vol 5, p 316.

<sup>40</sup> Cullen, 'Shell Minute Book', p 20, [uncatalogued]

<sup>41</sup> Southerwood, *Con Friend*, p 374.

succession." <sup>42</sup> It is reported that the new Bishop "was warmly welcomed" by clergy and people in the packed church, and that he re-appointed Fr Hall as his Vicar-General. On 13 June, the *Mercury* reports the Bishop's first reception in Launceston, where he received a "hearty welcome."

One personal letter to the new bishop survives, and it is highly revealing. It is from Dr Edward Swarbreck Hall, a medical practitioner and prominent Catholic layman, noted in the diocese for his expertise in the study of Scripture. He regularly wrote articles on the modern study of the Scriptures for the succession of Catholic papers in the colony during Murphy's episcopate. His letter is quoted in full, as it contains much of interest, throwing light on the church of which Murphy had arrived as chief pastor. It is dated 29 March, 1866.

Had I not been an invalid I should have been amongst the first of your Tasmanian Flock to offer you a cordial welcome on your arrival in your new episcopate.

I hope Your Lordship will not be disappointed with the small humble and poor people you have been appointed to the spiritual charge of. Few of the exalted and wealthy of the land are numbered amongst our communion. Nevertheless we have generally willing hearts and zeal fervent enough to do all in our power to advance the glory of God and the care of souls.

When Mrs Hall and I landed here on a Sunday morning, now nearly 33 years ago we proceeded to hear mass in a rude barn like room unceiled unplastered and floored with loose contorted boards that creaked and moved with every step. Father Conolly God rest the soul of my old friend was the only priest at that time in Tasmania. Since then I have seen respectable places of worship spring up in almost every district in the Island so that few Catholics are now out of reach of the Church ministrations when death threatens them. A numerous body of Clergy is now scattered over the colony of whom I feel assured that I can justly say that their exemplary conduct and zeal for the salvation of souls can scarcely be surpassed in any diocese of the Catholic world. Nevertheless there is a wide field for further improvements and it is gratifying to know that your Lordship is not new to such a charge. The knowledge of your arduous and successful labours in your Indian Episcopate preceded your arrival here and filled every true Catholic heart with joy and hope. You will find this Climate one of the most agreeable and healthful in the world and our medical experience shows that it is particularly propitious to those whose constitutions may have suffered from a long sojourn in India.

I am happy to inform you that we Catholics have not much to contend with in the shape of religious bigotry and have often received liberal contributions from other sects towards Catholic objects. For five years and a half at every quarterly meeting successively I have been re-elected Chairman of the Benevolent Society a Charity relieving destitution without any reference to creed or Country. On recently retiring

---

<sup>42</sup> The *Mercury*, Hobart, 4 May, 1866, *The Installation of the Rt Rev Dr Murphy*.



from the charge a very handsome unanimous vote of thanks for my 'impartial and honourable conduct' was presented to me by my associates in the executive committee. These fellow labourers represent nearly every religious denomination in the colony - one Catholic one Church of England one Church of Scotland, two Wesleyans, one Friend, one Independent, one Baptist. This will convince your Lordship that for beneficent purposes we can work with and earn the respect of our separated brethren. I hope that in a few days I shall be able to pay my respects to you personally - in the mean time wishing you health and every success in advancing the Kingdom of God amongst us. <sup>43</sup>

First to be noted is that Dr Hall warmly welcomes the newcomer. He refers to the general condition of the flock as made up of "small humble and poor people," largely without wealth or influence, but fervent and looking to "advance the glory of God and the care of souls." He looks back on the great strides made by the Church in the past 33 years, and speaks lovingly of Father Philip Conolly, whose reputation others had defamed. He points out the growth of churches and priests, and gives a ringing endorsement of the work of these priests.

He then alludes to Bishop Murphy's Indian service, and to the health problems that caused him to resign that post. Hobart is a wonderful place for those recovering from tropical exhaustion. This may pick up on some fears that had been apparent in Ireland when Dr Murphy was appointed to Hobart - fears that the colony would be too arduous for his health. <sup>44</sup> Dr Hall's assessment proved accurate, as Murphy was to thrive in this clime for a further 41 years, and die the oldest prelate in the Church!

The third paragraph of the letter is particularly valuable. It attests to the general low level of sectarian strife in the colony at this time. This is further seen in the wide acceptance Bishop Willson achieved in the colony, both as pastor and social reformer. The initial Anglican fears at his appointment appear to have settled, and Bishop Bromby was present at his farewell and signed the address. <sup>45</sup> Hall's inter-denominational committee is proof of this cross-confessional peace, which would be tested by odd incidents like the shooting of a British prince, or the visit of an axe-grinding ex-priest, but which was more pervasive than might be expected until the introduction of secular education, and the Catholic Church's refusal to accept this. Then sectarian uproar seems to have exploded, fuelled also by the

---

<sup>43</sup> CA 6/ MUR 2.

<sup>44</sup> Southerwood, *Con Friend*, p 370.

<sup>45</sup> Southerwood, *Con Friend*, p 369.

changes to the rules governing mixed marriages, forced on the Province by the incoming Irish bishops. Much of the earlier fellowship as Christians was then forgotten. Particularly interesting is Hall's use of the term "separated brethren" when referring to Protestants. This was re-introduced in the Document on Ecumenism of Vatican II, yet here we see its use pre-dating Vatican I. Such an indication of its use in 19th Century may surprise Catholics of today, and is testimony to that sterile period of sectarianism - largely the first sixty years of this century - when its use and meaning were forgotten.

Mention here should be made in passing of the later problems, perhaps foreseen by Bishop Willson, of accusations of nepotism made against the Bishop. Dr Murphy ultimately had four nephew priests, <sup>46</sup> and one sister, three nieces and a cousin as Presentation Sisters in his diocese. <sup>47</sup> Such accusations had not as yet surfaced, but it appears that it was the nephews who aroused the ire of the other clergy. They were Rev Michael Beechinor, Rev Daniel Beechinor and Rev Patrick Gleeson. The fourth nephew is not mentioned or identified in any archival material. To date, his identity has not been established. <sup>48</sup>

---

<sup>46</sup> ADB, p 316.

<sup>47</sup> Records of Early Presentation Sisters, Presentation Archives, Blackmans Bay.

<sup>48</sup> There is a rumour among the Presentation Sisters that one of the Bishop's nephews left the diocese and the priesthood, in the company of one of their number. Such a story would explain the lack of detail about the (last?) nephew.

### Teaching of the Pastorals of Daniel Murphy

The Pastoral letters of Dr Murphy are still resonant today, and in many ways continue to be relevant for today's Church and people. He was a skillful writer who tackled themes that often were at the core of the interests of his hearers. An examination of his pastorals in detail appears as Appendix 1, and a summary of their content appears as Appendix II. In this section it is intended to treat most of the major concerns that the bishop raised. These included dangers to the faith of Catholics in the predominantly Protestant society, especially from marriage with non-Catholics, the need for Catholic schools to preserve the faith, support for an embattled Papacy, and the duties and rights of Catholics in a Protestant realm.

In 1868, <sup>49</sup> he commenced the first stage of a concerted attempt to change the current culture which saw Catholics co-operating in some worship situations with Protestants. He reminds his flock of Church prohibitions on worship with non-Catholics, and re-inforces his idea that this includes church-going for marriages, funerals and prayer in private dwellings. This hard line against religious fraternisation was new to the diocese. Some Irish clerics had criticised the English Bishops Willson and Polding, and the Irish Goold, <sup>50</sup> for not taking a firmer line on mixed marriages in particular, and some of the push for Irish bishops, especially in Sydney, arose from this. Willson and his clergy had adopted the softer line, permitting mixed marriages to be celebrated in the church, before the altar, with due solemnity. <sup>51</sup> This would tend to change under his successor, and must have had an effect upon the gradually increasing Protestant distrust of the Catholic Church that we see during this episcopate of Dr Murphy.

His 1869 Pastoral for Lent <sup>52</sup> is very interesting in that it follows upon the shooting of the Duke of Edinburgh in Sydney by a crazed Irishman. He briefly deals with Lenten duties, Sabbath Day observance, and holy days of obligation. He then starts on the main purpose, which is quoted as one of the examples of his fine writing style in Appendix III. The

---

<sup>49</sup> CA 6/ MUR 17 Pastoral for Lent, 1868, by 'the Bishop of Hobart Town.'

<sup>50</sup> O'Farrell, *CC&C*, pp 202-3.

<sup>51</sup> Southerwood, *Con Friend*, p 279.

<sup>52</sup> CA 6/MUR 18, Pastoral for Lent, 1869, by 'the Bishop of Hobart Town.'

Bishop feared the rise of anti-Catholic feeling, but, as the last pastoral demonstrated, may have contributed to it himself in some measure. However, in this year, he must have recommended himself to the Governor and Legislature of the Colony, as he diffused a nasty moment by agreeing to persuade his people to abandon the St Patrick's Day dinner, <sup>53</sup> as Governor Gore-Brown feared an attack upon it in the wake of the shooting of the Duke of Edinburgh. This will be treated fully in a later section, but it foreshadowed the new Bishop's ability to work with the rulers of society, his good relations with them, and his conviction that the loyalty of Catholics to the Protestant state had to be above reproach.

The second pastoral for 1869 <sup>54</sup> comes from the Second Provincial Council of the Australian Church assembled in Melbourne in April. Bishop Murphy attended as senior suffragan bishop from the second oldest see of the province, and signed immediately after the Metropolitan. This document was important for the Church in the emerging nation and was promulgated <sup>55</sup> in all dioceses after Papal ratification. Its style throughout is similar to Dr Murphy's, and he refers to its teaching in future pastorals of his own. The Pastoral identified two dangers of the times: infidelity and indifferentism. These were defined in the Pastoral:

. . . infidelity, which is the rejection of God's truth; . . . indifferentism, which is the uprising of the spirit of Antichrist, lording it over God's truth by human opinion and choice . . .

Two special dangers flow from this - indifference in the education of the young in mixed schools, and indifference to mixed marriages. Dr Murphy was to make both of these major concerns in his diocesan teaching. Many future Pastorals would concentrate on mixed marriages, and on the need for Christian schooling, and he would rely on the authority of this Provincial Council document.

The 1870 Lenten Pastoral <sup>56</sup> was issued by Fr William Dunne, whom Murphy had appointed his Vicar-General. The Bishop was absent, attending the First Council of the

---

<sup>53</sup> Beechinor, *Memoir*, p 37.

<sup>54</sup> CA 6/MUR 30, 'The Pastoral Letter of the Archbishop and Bishops of the Province', assembled in the Second Provincial Council, 1869.

<sup>55</sup> CA 6/MUR21A, Pastoral for Lent, 1874, by 'the Bishop of Hobart Town.'

<sup>56</sup> CA 6/MUR 19, Pastoral for Lent, 1870, by the Vicar-General of Hobart Town.

Vatican, where he voted for papal infallibility.<sup>57</sup> His Vicar-General opens with a relatively short section on Lent, and then moves to the Council and its magnificence, and is keen to convey its importance, and to supply some details of the event. This appears as Appendix V. The tenor of the letter is in tune with the Bishop's ideas on a strong, centralist Papacy, as essential to his vision of the Church. This he will spell out in future Pastorals. Another Murphy theme is emphasised in closing. Parents are reminded that they must positively forbid the teaching of religion to their Catholic children in State schools, "for, in all cases in which Catholic parents omit, after receiving notice, to prohibit Protestant Teachers imparting religious instruction to their children, their omission is assumed as their express consent to have such religious instruction imparted, . . ."

The 1871 Lenten Pastoral<sup>58</sup> was issued by Bishop Murphy, and he takes the opportunity to reflect upon the Council. He opens with a reminder of the meaning of Lent, in two paragraphs, and then gets to the substance for this year: "In these days of wrath, calamity, and misery, we have to deplore the trials and sufferings which Divine Providence has permitted to fall upon His Church, and her Supreme Pontiff . . ." Here is found another of the major themes of the Murphy years - loyalty and devotion to the See of Rome and the person of the Pope, especially in his difficulties with rising Italian nationalism. This pastoral is important as it would strike a chord with its hearers, predominantly Irish, simple and uneducated, viewing the Papacy as their protector in persecution, and attuned to the happenings in Rome by the reports to them of both Bishop Willson and Bishop Murphy. The natural sympathy of both the Irish and English Churches for their suffering Pontiff means that this statement of support for the Pope was significant in his struggle with the new Italian state. This was reinforced when the Pope replied to Bishop Murphy directly in October of that year, thanking him and his people for the support they had offered to the Holy See. His letter<sup>59</sup> was read in all the churches.

The 1873 Lenten Pastoral<sup>60</sup> was written on the subject of education, which would become

---

<sup>57</sup> ADB, p 316.

<sup>58</sup> CA 6/MUR 20, Pastoral for Lent, 1871, by 'the Bishop of Hobart Town.'

<sup>59</sup> CA 6/MUR 3.

<sup>60</sup> *The Tasmanian Catholic Herald*, 22 Feb, 1873, pp 115-6, Pastoral for Lent, by 'the Bishop of Hobart Town.'

an increasingly important issue as secular systems were rising in many parts of the world. He begins by quoting Deut 4. 9: "Keep thyself, therefore, and thy soul carefully. Forget not the words that thy eyes have seen, and let them not go out of thy heart all the days of thy life. Thou shalt teach them to thy sons and grandsons." He mentions the "diversity of new systems of education, which have been . . . forced on Catholic peoples . . . The Church has adhered to . . . a system based on and guided by religion." He refers to a meeting in St Joseph's Church last September in support of such a system. All were unanimous, and there was great depth of feeling expressed. A petition to Parliament was organised from all over the colony, and will be presented in the coming May. This affirms that education not guided by religion would be dangerous to the faith and morals of the children. This position was supported by quotations from authorities in the United States, England, Ireland and Germany.

His next Pastoral for Lent 1874 <sup>61</sup> reflected on Church councils - general, provincial and local synods, and moved to his favourite topics of education and the struggle for a just share of the education vote, and mixed marriages. He announces local synodal decrees on these matters, arising from the adoption of the decrees of the Provincial Council of 1869. These formalise the mechanisms for establishing more Catholic schools, and establish the new regime for mixed marriages, confining their "celebration" to the sacristy. This reversal of the policy of Dr Willson was not well accepted by Catholics, and increased the temperature of the sectarian debate.

A large gap exists in the record and the next Lenten Pastoral is issued for 1877. <sup>62</sup> This one concerns the problem of the first St Mary's Cathedral which now needed to be demolished as unsafe. It was closed and the Bishop returned his Chair to St Joseph's. This was a matter of great moment to the diocese and even to the wider community. The Governor chaired meetings on the subject and headed the subscription list - another indication that sectarian ill-feeling was not yet at the peak it was to reach.

The Pastoral on the Indian Relief Fund, 1877 <sup>63</sup> was occasioned by the famine in Madras,

---

<sup>61</sup> CA 6/MUR 21A & B, Pastoral for Lent, 1874, by 'the Bishop of Hobart Town.'

<sup>62</sup> *The Tasmanian Catholic Standard*, Feb, 1877, p 56, Pastoral for Lent, by 'the Bishop of Hobarton.'

<sup>63</sup> *The Tasmanian Catholic Standard*, Nov, 1877, Pastoral by 'the Bishop of Hobarton.'

and the Bishop recalls the Governor's chairing a meeting in the Hobart Town Hall to appeal for funds "to assist in allaying this terrible visitation." It demonstrated his concern for problems in other parts of the world. Dr Murphy, well into the fund-raising appeal to rebuild the Cathedral, is still aware of calls on the charity of his Church that are acute enough to displace local concerns for a short time.

In the Pastoral for Lent, 1878, <sup>64</sup> the Bishop begins by quoting 1 Pet 5. 8, "Be sober and watch: . . . the devil, as a roaring lion . . . seeking whom he may devour." He intends this year to encourage temperance. "Intemperance grievously offends God . . . his wonderful creation" is for man's "use and benefit. . . Those gifts must be used in a rational manner, . . . in accordance with the advice of St. Paul, 'Whether you eat or drink or what ever else you do, do all to the glory of God, 1 Cor. 10. 31'; but the intemperate man abuses those gifts, dishonours God, and grievously offends him, . . ." This is the only example of Dr Murphy treating a subject beloved by preachers influenced by Jansenism. He did not have an inclination to "wowserism". Dr Murphy's pastorals, unlike those of Dr Willson, <sup>65</sup> are not insistent on these themes. He then moves to Roman events, close to his own heart, and those of his hearers. He mentions at length the death of Pius IX and the election of Leo XIII. Bishop Murphy is consistently a supporter of a strong Papacy. Such an institution is essential to his view of the Church, and he would have no truck with Gallican ideas. The acid test is the one of money - he orders the re-introduction of the collection for the Pope, even when struggling to fund his Cathedral and his schools.

The Bishop begins the Pastoral for Lent, 1879, <sup>66</sup> by quoting Col 2. 8-7 (sic). He points out that St Paul "warns his hearers against the philosophy of the time." This warning is applicable today "for the so-called modern philosophy is impregnated with Pagan errors," and leads many astray as it "denies the existence of a personal God, confounding his nature with that of the world, . . ." He then summarises the propositions anathematised by Vatican 1, and some anathematised by the Syllabus of Errors. He urges all to adhere to the words of the Pope, there quoted, to avoid these errors. Dr Murphy has indicated his

---

<sup>64</sup> CA 6/MUR 22, Pastoral for Lent, 1878, by 'the Bishop of Hobart Town.'

<sup>65</sup> Southerwood, *Con Friend*, p 107.

<sup>66</sup> CA 6/MUR 23, Pastoral for Lent, 1879, by 'the Bishop of Hobart Town.'

grasp of the theology of God and how He relates to His creation. This familiarity with theology and the ability to make it understandable to his hearers is one of his gifts. He can also apply these theological principles, backed up with a knowledge of Scripture, which he usually uses so accurately, to draw conclusions for the circumstances of his time. He ends the Pastoral with a long section decrying the results of secular education in the colonies and around the world. The breadth of learning in the Bishop is apparent in much of his writing. Such learning was not universal among the Irish bishops of the time - Bishop Lanigan of Goulburn being described by Bishop Matthew Quinn as having "neither the health, intelligence or pluck required here just now." <sup>67</sup>

*The Catholic Standard*, March, 1880, p 40, reprints some paragraphs of Bishop Murphy's Lenten Pastoral, 1880. The Bishop begins with an appeal for funds for the famine in Ireland, asking his people to support the civic appeal opened by the Mayor of Hobart Town, showing again his capacity to see needs beyond those of his own diocese. The paper then summarises the section of the Pastoral on perjury: -" . . . 'Truth and justice,' continues the Bishop, 'are, dearly beloved brethren, qualities which according to natural as well as divine law should characterise the conduct of man at all times in his relation with both God and his fellow man.'" These problems must have been notable in the colony for this sort of offensive to be mounted against them. The "good citizen" theme of Murphy's teaching is apparent again here.

Dr Murphy's Pastoral for Lent, 1881, <sup>68</sup> begins by quoting Eph 5. 30 "This is a great sacrament: but I speak in Christ and in the Church," which is today translated "this mystery has great significance, but I am applying it to Christ and the Church." The Bishop is teaching on marriage, which "has always held . . . a most important position in the world; . . ." He sets out the Church's teaching on the holiness of marriage, and warns against the dangers of thoughtless engagements, and ties problems in both areas to indifference and infidelity, as condemned by the Provincial Council of 1869.

---

<sup>67</sup> O'Farrell, *CC&C*, p 128.

<sup>68</sup> CA 6/MUR 24, Pastoral for Lent, by 'the Bishop of Hobarton.'



His Pastorals for Lent, 1882, <sup>69</sup> and for Lent 1883, <sup>70</sup> both deal with the purpose of that season. He had treated this in his first Pastoral, and then but mentioned it in passing to other subjects subsequently.

Bishop Murphy begins his Pastoral for Lent, 1884, <sup>71</sup> with Sir 7. 25, "Hast thou children; instruct them and bow their necks from their childhood," and Eph 6. 4, "And you, fathers, provoke not your children to anger, but bring them up in the discipline and correction of the Lord." He continues to emphasise the need for Catholic schools, and the duty of parents to send their children to such schools.

In his Lenten Pastoral, 1885, <sup>72</sup> Dr Murphy begins by quoting "'The heavens show forth the glory of God, and the Firmament declareth the work of his hands.' - Ps 18. 1." (Now often numbered as Ps 19.) He opens with the thought that the universe must lead us to God as we consider it. This new age has attempted to subvert the supernatural order and impose reason alone as guide. Such people reject the doctrines about God and His Church, and, denouncing marriage, destroy the foundations of society. They deny God a place in education. Such hold that all power comes from the people, not God. This prepares the way for anarchy and paganism. The Church knows hostile governments through the world which operate upon such principles. She is the chief object of their hatred. The overthrow of the temporal power of the Papacy is the outcome of this. He then extrapolates that such governments attack Christian education. Thus the Church is forced to establish Church schools. In this Pastoral, Dr Murphy has managed to tie together all the concerns that have featured in a major way in his teaching.

The Pastoral for Lent 1891, by the Archbishop of Hobart, <sup>73</sup> is the first preserved in the series, after the elevation of the See to Metropolitan status. He begins with Eph 5. 32-33, "This is a great sacrament, but I speak in Christ and in the Church. Nevertheless, let every one of you in particular love his wife as himself: and let the wife fear her husband," and

---

<sup>69</sup> CA 6/MUR 25, Pastoral for Lent, by 'the Bishop of Hobartton.'

<sup>70</sup> CA 6/MUR 26, Pastoral for Lent, 1883, by 'the Bishop of Hobart.'

<sup>71</sup> CA 6/MUR 27, Pastoral for Lent, 1884, by 'the Bishop of Hobart.'

<sup>72</sup> *The Catholic Standard*, March, 1885, p 232, Pastoral for Lent, by 'the Bishop of Hobart.'

<sup>73</sup> CA 6/MUR 28, Pastoral for Lent, 1891, by 'the Archbishop of Hobart.'

Luke 16. 18, "Everyone that putteth away his wife and marrieth another, committeth adultery; he that marrieth her that is put away from her husband, committeth adultery." His message is against the increasing tide of divorce. He also stresses the equality of husband and wife within the marriage bond. The Archbishop then includes news of a letter to bishops from Pope Leo on the question of slavery and Africa.

The Pastoral Letter of the Plenary Council, 1905,<sup>74</sup> is the next Pastoral following that of 1891, and there will not be another from the Archbishop till 1907, the year of his death. As it is possible that Dr Delany is the author of that pastoral, which they both signed, the question arises as to why Dr Murphy, who, to date, has been regular with his duty to issue pastorals, should now fail in that duty for a space of about fourteen years. There is not one for these years preserved in the set in the Archives, nor have any been recovered from the Catholic papers of the time, although there are not complete collections of these journals. Given the probable authorship of the 1907 Pastoral, if the Archbishop was unable to write, because of advancing age, why did not Dr Delany issue them in the Archbishop's name? Perhaps he was not allowed to, a result of his replacing the Beechinor nomination of the Archbishop? None of Dr Delany's material in the Archives bears on his relationship with the ageing Murphy, and certainly the Archbishop leaves no clue.

In concluding this section on his teaching, one is compelled to the conclusion that Bishop Murphy was a talented and effective teacher of Gospel values in his time. His learning generally, and in the areas of Scripture and theology specifically, contributed to his effectiveness. He seems to have got his message consistently right in print and pulpit, a habit that would not always accompany his message in administration or in action as Bishop. It is to this that attention now turns.

---

<sup>74</sup> CA 6/MUR 31, 'Pastoral Letter of the Cardinal Delegate, Archbishops and Bishops of the Australian Commonwealth', Third Plenary Council, 1905.

---

**The Archbishop's Rule of the Diocese**

Dr Murphy's 41 years in Tasmania were marked by the sort of development that he had achieved in Hyderabad - churches and schools built, with the fabric being well looked after by the Bishop and his team of priests and people. What is much harder to assess is his impact, as chief pastor of the Catholic Church, on the diocese and on the colony. Because of the paucity of records bearing on him personally, and on his work with his people, this side of him has had to be reconstructed from sources such as his Pastoral letters, which have been looked at, and now conclusions need to be drawn from them, along with other information remaining in the Archives, and especially that which is recorded in the Catholic and secular press of his time. His predecessor, Dr Willson, is a much better known figure, as Bishop, pastor, social reformer and citizen. We have little direct evidence of Murphy's pastoral concerns, none of his ministrations to convicts, the condemned, the insane, the poor, or sinners in his Church, as we have with Willson. There are no campaigns of social reform we know of that were his, apart from the concerns he had in common with most other colonial bishops of his time. We do have some evidence as to his civic role. We have to start with what we know, and then speculate upon the areas he has left devoid of evidence about him. In looking at the history of the Catholic Press of his day, we get some clues about our subject. Fortunately Monsignor Cullen has recorded this.

CATHOLIC PRESS (of early period)

The Tasmanian Catholic Standard, edited and managed by Father Dunne appeared monthly from 27-7-1867 to 20-6-1872. It ceased when the Editor went overseas. The Catholic Herald was issued fortnightly from 10-8-1872 to 12-7-1873. With Bishop Murphy's approval Joseph Roper and Henry Shirley revived the TCS, monthly on 1-1-1876.

(Reference supplied at end of entire quotation).

An advertisement, from an unspecified publication, exists for *The Catholic Herald*, dated August 7, 1872, announcing the closure of the *Tasmanian Catholic Standard*, (version I) and informing the reader of the new paper "as the only authorised Catholic Journal." Fr T Kelsh was the Editor, and the proprietor was "Mr WE Sullivan." <sup>75</sup> There appeared to have been no troubles with the Dunne paper, either from the Bishop or his nephews. Fr Dunne was appointed Vicar General by the new Bishop, following the death of Fr Hall. Fr

---

<sup>75</sup> Archives of the Presentation Sisters, Blackmans Bay.

Kelsh's *The Catholic Herald* seems to have been published for about a year, without incident, and its issues are complete in the Archives. It must be noted that it, too, had a clerical editor.

The first issue of the *Tasmanian Catholic Standard* (version II) in the Archives is dated 'November 1st, 1876.' (Cullen mis-wrote the date as 1-1-1876.) It contained an endorsement from Bishop Murphy:- "Mr H Shirley proposes republishing under ecclesiastical supervision the Catholic Standard on the same principle on which that periodical was originally conducted, viz: The advancement of the Catholic Religion and Catholic Education, I therefore have much pleasure in giving this laudable undertaking my sanction and support, and wish it all the success it merits. + Daniel Murphy, Bishop of Hobart Town."

Joseph Roper had been a long time friend of Bishop Willson,<sup>76</sup> who converted him from Quakerism to Catholicism in Nottingham, and then, after the first Bishop's arrival in the colony, was prevailed upon by his friend to bring his family to Hobart. This is attested to by a hand-written note of Monsignor Cullen.<sup>77</sup> He must be considered as the founder of a Tasmanian Catholic family that was to become renowned for faithfulness and service to the Church. He himself was a teacher, gifted in Apologetics, and frequently in print on this subject through Catholic journals. Along with Dr Hall, who was the leading exponent of Scriptural Theology in the colonial Church, they were among the few laymen of note during the episcopate of Dr Willson and for the first half of that of Dr Murphy.<sup>78</sup>

Dr Murphy not only permitted and encouraged the foundation of the Catholic press in the colony, but he also clearly felt a need to control closely the journals bearing the Church's name. The Cullen quotation continues: "This TCS failed to please someone (probably the Beechinors). Hence, in July 1878 a Tasmanian Catholic Standard appeared 'as the only organ approved by the Bishop'." The *Tasmanian Catholic Standard*, Vol II, No 16, (version III) appeared February 1, 1878, with the following endorsement under the masthead:- "From His Lordship Bishop Murphy:- 'I hereby sanction the publication of

---

<sup>76</sup> Cullen 'Shell' Minute Book, p 29, [uncatalogued]

<sup>77</sup> CA 6/MUR 62, Hand-written note by JH Cullen, attached to this item.

<sup>78</sup> The Catholic papers in the Archives contain many articles by these gentlemen.

the *Tasmanian Catholic Standard*, the property of Mr RG Fitzsimons, under conditions agreed to by him, and I recommend it as the only authorised Catholic Church organ in this Diocese. + Daniel Murphy, Bishop of Hobart Town." (It appears that Cullen may be out by about 6 months as to the first publication under the new arrangement.) The remainder of the Cullen quotation is as follows:

The Editor was the Rev MJ Beechinor. He had no qualifications for such a position. In the new circumstances Roper and Shirley kept their paper going as the 'Catholic Standard'. The Battle of the Standards ended in the defeat of MJB's paper. Most of the clergy and the interested laity preferred Roper's paper. After Roper's death (10-2-1889) his 'Catholic Standard' was kept going by Henry Shirley, Senator E Mulcahy and others. This paper claimed to be 'the only Tasmanian Catholic organ that has been a financial success.'<sup>79</sup> That Joseph Roper supported Henry Shirley in the dispute with the Bishop and his nephews, lends weight to the idea that he considered a matter of conscience was involved. Add to this the Cullen claim that "Most of the clergy and interested laity preferred Roper's paper,"<sup>80</sup> and we have the beginnings of a problem for Bishop Murphy and his nephews. *The Tasmanian Catholic Standard*, February, 1878, is misprinted, p 22 following on the reverse side of p 25, and p 26 appearing on the reverse of p 21. The Rev Michael Beechinor is the editor and writer of this article. It gives much weight to Cullen's claim "He had no qualifications for such a position."<sup>81</sup> It outlines the reasons the Bishop had for the setting up of a new authorised paper - the bankruptcy of Henry Shirley, and the Bishop's loss of confidence in Joseph Roper, who allegedly had not supported the plans to re-build the Cathedral, and who was accused of publishing his opposition to the plan in letters to the *Mercury*. The article also condemned both Shirley and Roper for continuing to publish their paper as *The Catholic Standard*.

Here let us suggest that it is utterly useless and injurious to religion to oppose the action of the Church by circulating an unauthorised 'Catholic' journal in this diocese. The Church's action will prevail, all other action will fail. Childlike obedience to the Church will please God and best promote the spiritual and temporal welfare of all.

In these words, it can be seen that Beechinor, if not his uncle the Bishop, was not immune from the Irish bishops' sense of 'episcopal absolutism' that was to so bedevil the last years

---

<sup>79</sup> Cullen, Shell Minute Book, p 36, [uncatalogued]

<sup>80</sup> Cullen, Shell Minute Book, p 36, [uncatalogued], quoted in the foregoing.

<sup>81</sup> Cullen, Shell Minute Book, p 36, [uncatalogued], quoted in the foregoing.

of Archbishop Polding and Bishop Goold, on mainland Australia. Generally, it appears that Daniel Murphy kept himself distant from the scheming of fellow Irish bishops like the brothers Quinn, Murray and Lanigan;<sup>82</sup> but within his own diocese, the story may have been different.

The above article is followed immediately by another that bears on the problem. It announces the Bishop's comments at a Clergy conference at his house on the 23 January. He told the eight priests present his reasons for withdrawing his approbation from the Shirley-Roper paper. He asked that they promote the newly-authorised paper, *The Tasmanian Catholic Standard*. "His Lordship concluded by reading from one of the Canons of the Council of Trent, the law regarding the publication of religious periodicals or books without the sanction of the Ordinary of the Diocese." This included the penalty of excommunication for breach of the canon.

This Canon applied properly to books. Perhaps this, along with the idea that the Bishop and Fr Michael Beechinor had been unjust to Mr Shirley, explains why many priests and people preferred the unofficial paper, leading to the demise of the official one. As Cullen remarks, Michael Beechinor lacked the skills to produce or edit the paper. This edition is testimony to that, with its misprints, unclear prose, and wrong formatting. The charge against the previous Editor, that he opposed the Cathedral rebuilding, and had not promoted it by writing a Leader on the subject, is made to look hollow by the constant reporting in past issues of the Cathedral appeals. The last edition under the old management contained a two and a quarter pages report of the return to Hobart of Rev Daniel Beechinor, "from the neighbouring colonies, where he had been engaged for the past fifteen months in collecting subscriptions in aid of the fund for the rebuilding of St Mary's Cathedral." Mr RG Fitzsimons read an address to him, which is reported in full, and Beechinor's reply, recounting all he had done and where he had been, covers two pages, bar a paragraph! It also printed the subscription list of donors in full, covering four and a bit columns, each the length of the page. Such coverage was not unusual back through past issues. Murphy's Lenten Pastoral, 1877, on the rebuilding of the Cathedral, had been reprinted in full. Indeed, this Pastoral is missing from the Archive set, and it was only from this paper that it

---

<sup>82</sup> O'Farrell, P, *CC&C*, pp 199-203.

was retrieved. Regular updates on Cathedral re-building occurred in the earlier papers in the feature 'Local Intelligence.'

A search of the Letters to the Editor in the *Mercury* of the period has not turned up one letter protesting the design or re-building of the Cathedral. Such did not seem to be an issue at that time. Letters touching on the Bishop and his nephews there are, but not concerning the Cathedral.

It appears that the 'Battle of the *Standards*' did result in the Bishop invoking the excommunication powers of the Trent Decree. Rev Joseph Roper, writing privately from Propaganda College, Rome, where he was studying for the priesthood, a student of Dr Murphy, and from where he was regularly published in his father's papers as "Our Own Correspondent," certainly thought so. A type-written summary of these letters was sent to Archbishop Simonds by a nephew of Fr Joseph Roper, for his interest. He told the Archbishop:-

The student whose letters from the Propaganda contain the extracts herein produced, was the son of Mr Joseph Roper of Hobart Town, as it was then called. Mr Roper was a convert (of) Father Willson of Nottingham, England. When Father William was made Bishop of Tasmania, he sent for his convert and friend to come to Tasmania to take charge of his Cathedral school. In addition . . . Mr Roper established and edited the first Catholic paper in Tasmania - 'The Catholic Standard'. He made way, many years later for religious teachers in his school, but persevered with his paper until his death. . . . I have extracted from the student's letters only such matter as is of general Catholic interest. These letters are addressed to his sister in New South Wales, - (the mother of the writer of this material.)

These extracts cover much more ground than is shown here, where the interest is in how they bear upon the dispute arising with the two *Standards*.

Propaganda, Rome. 2nd May 1878.

. . . Accounts have come to Rome concerning the state of affairs in Tasmania between the Bishop and priests. I hope all will be settled before I return, for from what I hear there is likely to be a deal of trouble there. If everything is not settled soon, I will write home begging someone - either Father Dunne or Father Kelsh, if they think I would be in any way implicated on my return, and if so, perhaps I could manage to go elsewhere in Australia till everything was settled.<sup>83</sup>

Note that the problem is seen as being between the Bishop and his priests. The student is

---

<sup>83</sup> CA 6 MUR 62 item 1 "Extracts from the letters of an early Australian student at the Propaganda," p 7. Type written without date for the compilation. A letter to Archbishop Simonds from Joseph Lynch, of Haberfield, Sydney, dated 22 July, 1941, son of the sister of Fr Roper, containing the "extracts I have made from letters which Father Joseph Basil Roper wrote from the Propaganda to my mother," explains the document's compilation.

clearly concerned about how this family problem will rebound upon him. As a priest, and as a Roper, he could hardly fail to be implicated. He spells out more of the problem in a following letter.

Propaganda, Rome. 18 May 1878.

... I have spoken to several persons about the excommunication fulminated against the readers of the Standard at the Huon, Tasmania, and all seem to condemn the actions of the bishop and his nephews. One especially, the Spiritual Director of the College, spoke strongly against the excommunication, and said if the Propaganda heard of it, the Bishop would be called to order. It is a great pity that such a scandal should ever happen, more especially in a country like Australia.<sup>84</sup>

Here the Bishop and his nephews are spelt out as the cause. This student is less than a year from ordination, and at the heart of the Church, and he knows that Dr Murphy's alleged actions are illicit. Nearly two years later, and after his ordination in Rome as a priest for his native Tasmania, Fr Joseph is still concerned.

Propaganda, Rome. 15 January 1880.

(Concerning the ordination day of Fr Roper:-) ... and Monsignor, the Bishop of Adelaide, was invited to dinner. He sat beside me. Of course we spoke of Australia, ... the trouble in Hobart Town. I asked him if he did not think I would find myself in an awkward position when I returned. He proposed to write to Bishop Murphy asking him to allow me to remain with him, Bishop Reynolds, in Adelaide, till affairs were settled. After consideration I agreed and am awaiting the answer. It was very kind of Monsignor Reynolds, and I think I have done what is right.<sup>85</sup>

The problem is obviously a continuing one, and no storm in a teacup. This is evidence of Dr Murphy's ability to continue a fight stubbornly and in the face of reflection, reason, and the continuing opposition of his priests. There is a certain irrational aspect here, because, without the support of those same priests for his position and their unique ability and opportunity to present his case to the people, the Bishop is destined to lose.

Fr Roper next reports on a communication from Bishop Murphy, and it appears as if all had been resolved:-

Propaganda, Rome. 6th March, 1880.

Besides your welcome letter, I received by the last mail a very kind note from Dr Murphy with instructions regarding my return. I am to go to England and wait there till two young men are ordained priests, which will be at Pentecost, and to return to Tasmania with them. ...<sup>86</sup>

The reply of the Bishop had been charming and convincing enough to dispel the gnawing

---

<sup>84</sup> CA 6 MUR 62 item 1, p 10.

<sup>85</sup> CA 6 MUR 62 item 1, p 28.

<sup>86</sup> CA 6 MUR 62 item 1, p 29.



doubts of the last two years, but something else upset this communication. The last letter to his father contained the resurrected doubts, and Fr Roper does indeed go to Adelaide, perhaps not pleasing Bishop Murphy, who can ill-afford to lose young priests. The student wrote this last letter to his father, from:

St Peter's Dome Place, Leamington, Warwickshire, 23/8/80.

. . . what interests you most is my leaving which will be by the Cotopaxi. Monsignor Reynolds will go with me, and several priests for the diocese of Adelaide. His Lordship is now in Port Augusta, Scotland, and will shortly go to Dublin, where, perhaps, I will go to meet him. He has been unwell, and that is the cause of our delay in starting. . . . you cannot imagine how anxious I am to get home. I am quite sick of rambling. If we leave on the 18th September, I shall be home about the end of October.

Father Roper reached Adelaide - 8th November, 1880.

was transferred to Tasmania - June 1882.

Died, 22 July, 1884. Aged 27 years.<sup>87</sup>

The material in the Archives is silent on any further revelation of the problem. Unfortunately, the copies of the two *Standards* are incomplete, and the first issue of the unapproved version of the Roper-Shirley paper has been cut from the bound volume of the *Catholic Standard*. Tantalising hints are all that remain, but enough to have made the *Australian Dictionary of Biography* record "He had four nephews who were priests in Tasmania and was often accused of nepotism. In 1892 he again visited Rome and tried to have Daniel Beechinor appointed coadjutor, but after petitions to Rome from his priests Bishop Patrick Delany was appointed in December 1893 to assist the ageing 'nephew-ridden' Murphy."<sup>88</sup>

The secular press is much more enlightening on this issue. The *Mercury* both reported the events as they unfolded, and printed letters, which all appear to be from Catholics, touching on the problem. First notice of the problem came from a Letter to the Editor, published on Thursday, 31 January, 1878, and signed "Anti-Humbug." The writer quotes from a letter written by "a reliable authority at the Huon, dated 28 inst."

From the altar at Franklin Sunday last, as at Honeywood on the previous Sunday, the Rev J Murphy, by order of his Bishop, read the form of excommunication to all Catholics, who should take or read, or hear read, a newspaper now published in opposition to the Bishop's paper (*The Tasmanian Catholic Standard*) and known as *The Catholic Standard*, which has not His Lordship's approbation. Any Catholic taking this paper, after this notice, incurred excommunication and could not receive

---

<sup>87</sup> CA 6 MUR 62 item 1, p 29.

<sup>88</sup> ADB, p 316.

the Sacraments, nor could he have Christian burial. The writer then says he presumes that this was announced in all Catholic churches in the diocese.

On Monday, 4 February, Henry Hunter wrote rejecting the substance of the first letter. No such notice was read at the Pro-Cathedral. He himself reads *The Catholic Standard*, published by "a well-known and deservedly respected Catholic gentleman," and it has done nothing to deserve such treatment. The architect of the new cathedral seems to be in the dark as to these events. The next writer, immediately following Hunter's letter, was in no doubt at all.

Signing himself "Nepotism," he pulled no punches, stating "nothing, no matter how monstrous, that could be done by the family now at the head of the Catholic community in this colony, could by any possibility create such a feeling in my mind, I shall, . . . substitute indignation at the unworthy and dastardly attempt to intimidate the Catholics of the Huon." He continues, saying that they were selected because "they are a simple people, likely to comply." He concludes by asking what have the Catholics of the colony become since Bishop Willson left, at which time they stood so high in the estimation of society. "If there is a spark of manly feeling left in them, they will resent this, the last but by no means the greatest injury that has been inflicted upon them." He suggests that Catholics meet "like men" to consider an appeal to the Archbishop of Melbourne.

On Wednesday, 6 February, "A Catholic Layman," later identified as Dr ES Hall, wrote a scholarly letter. He quotes the Canon of Trent in Latin and English, and shows clearly that it does not apply, and has been reported in the *Tasmanian Catholic Standard* disjointedly and in part. He hopes that the "ghost of excommunication will be speedily laid," and protests the inequity of this action being confined to the Huon.

On Tuesday, 12 February, "A Lover of Peace" takes issue with "A Catholic Layman." He challenges the latter's interpretation of the Canon of Trent, claiming it is at the Bishop's discretion. However, he "will not believe that our venerable Bishop intended to apply this to *The Catholic Standard*." Fr Murphy has mistaken the Bishop's intention through "holy simplicity." He hopes that the "Battle of the Standards may soon be over."

The possibility of the matter resting here, as a mistaken action of Fr Murphy after hearing

the Bishop's words at the clergy conference, might have succeeded. The last letter, aimed at such a solution, looks suspiciously like a Rev DFX Beechinor attempt to paper over the scandal. However, the educated laity of the diocese did not accept the "solution."

Saturday, 16 February, had Dr ES Hall in print in the *Mercury*. He had waited till now, hoping to see that "Anti-Humbug's" letter was proved wrong. He now has had confirmation of that letter. A letter of Fr John Murphy to a friend has been given to him, and he has the permission of the writer and the receiver to make use of it. This states that Fr John did what he did in the presence of "two visiting Bishops and Fr Dan" Beechinor. He had used the words "at the Bishop's command" to convey to his people that this was not of his choosing, nor did he approve. At the time, while Bishop Crane (Sandhurst), and Bishop Murray (Maitland), had been in the sanctuary with "Fr Dan", Bishop Murphy was in the adjacent vestry. He comments that in a small wooden church, the Bishop could not help but hear what he, Fr John, had said. Neither the Bishop nor his nephew objected to what he had said as "mistaken." Fr John continued that Mr Roper "has the sympathy and respect of all in the district." Dr Hall then says that such respect is widespread, embracing the priests and people "of all Tasmania."

The writer comments that Fr John should have asked for such a command in writing. He affirms the unity that exists between this priest and his people in the Huon, and repeats his previous statements that the Canon of Trent does not apply, and restates the case that he argued previously as "A Catholic Layman." He again criticises the "mutilated and disjointed" extracts of the Canon printed in Fr Michael Beechinor's paper, and reveals that in reporting the Clergy conference, *The Tasmanian Catholic Standard* had failed to report that six of the eight priests present had opposed the Bishop's action against *The Catholic Standard*. He says "Lover of Peace" is also guilty of quoting with omissions in his letter. He affirms that he always has had good relations with His Lordship, and had the Bishop not been surrounded by so many relatives, the problem would never have arisen. Dr Hall concludes by quoting the Canons of Trent outlawing nepotism, and spells it out as a historical evil in the Church, and the bane of just administration.

The same edition has a letter from "A Working Man" suggesting that both papers be tolerated. He claims that "the old *Standard*" has been unfairly treated, and appeals "Let us

have no intimidation."

Wednesday, 20 February, brought a news report from a correspondent at Honeywell. A meeting of local Catholics was called and Dr Hall's "clear and masterly" letter read. Several speakers condemned the actions of the Bishop, and the meeting expressed upset at the home visits of the Rev Daniel Beechinor to collect for the Cathedral, but warning all he visited of the danger of excommunication. The meeting stated that they know Fr John will not excommunicate anyone, short of a direct order from the Bishop, and passed a motion of confidence in their priest. They resolved to write to Dr Murphy asking why they were singled out, expressing their opposition to the unfair treatment of Mr Shirley, and deploring the attempts to suppress the opposition of the priests at the Clergy Conference. Another motion rejected receiving *The Tasmanian Catholic Standard* into their homes. A similar meeting was planned for Franklin.

On Thursday, 21 February, "A Lover of Peace" again wrote accusing Dr Hall of misreading the Trent Canon. Again he claims that such powers are at episcopal discretion, and that Fr John Murphy "imagined" that the Bishop wanted him to read the excommunication notice. This letter then tells of the writer's regard for Mr Roper and *The Catholic Standard*. It appears as an increasingly desperate attempt to salvage credibility from the affair by denial. This impression is enhanced by the immediately following letter from Fr John Murphy.

He claims that the private letter was published without the authority of the receiver. (Dr Hall had clearly stated that he had the approval of both writer and receiver. Nor did the Honeywell meeting mention this, when they approved of and endorsed the doctor's letter.) Fr John continues that he now thinks Bishop Murphy did not hear his announcement from the altar. The priest now realises that he had no command so to act from the Bishop, and he apologises to His Lordship for thinking that he had such a command. This letter is very thin on credibility by failing to deal with the issue of Fr Daniel Beechinor clearly hearing the threat in the church, and openly warning against excommunication in his home visitation. Its lack of credibility would soon be another issue in the saga.

On Saturday, 9 March, the *Mercury* published a letter from "One of the Correspondents", who mentions that *The Tasmanian Catholic Standard* has condemned the letters in the *Mercury*, all of which have been published under the heading "Excommunication." Fr

Michael Beechinor, the editor of *The Tasmanian Catholic Standard*, claimed that the events in the Huon never occurred, and that Fr John's letter proved it. This writer comments that Fr Michael would be far better advised to "let the matter lie quiet." This was good advice, as it was over two weeks since this issue had appeared last in the *Mercury*.

This was followed, on Thursday, 14 March, by a further breakout, in response to these interventions by the Beechinors. A correspondent, writing as "Truth", said that since Fr John's letter of three weeks ago, he had waited each day for an admission from Fr Daniel Beechinor that he had been the cause of the problem, but rather than do this, that priest had continued to hide behind his uncle, the Bishop. The writer must now question the statement that the Bishop knew nothing of this matter, and announces that he knows of one case where a Catholic has been denied the Sacraments in this affair. He appeals to Fr Daniel to end the matter by an admission of the truth.

Saturday, 16 March, had "Nepotism" in print again. He states that he had experienced the problems created by nepotism since writing his last letter. He feels compelled to blame Fr John for allowing himself to be bullied and so writing a "stupid letter." The good of Catholics in the colony demanded that this be said. Who could be foolish enough to consider that people would not see clearly who had dictated the letter? He is "amazed" that *The Tasmanian Catholic Standard* should deny that it ever happened. This is clearly "an untruthful statement."

The same issue has a moderate letter from "Freedom" suggesting a truce, with the amalgamation of both papers, so that they appear on alternate fortnights. This could lead to obedience from the laity, who, in return, should be allowed "legitimate freedom." This letter marks the end of the correspondence on this subject in the *Mercury*.

The debate had been conducted by nine correspondents in thirteen letters, with one news item on the Honeywell meeting. It began in the columns on 31 January, and was in the paper at least twice weekly until Fr John's letter on 21 February. There was then a break of about sixteen days, during which time Fr Michael Beechinor published an attack on this *Mercury* correspondence in his paper. His denial of the events in the Huon caused a flare-up of the matter, with demands that Fr Daniel Beechinor admit liability for the whole affair, and another declaring that Fr John's letter was "dictated." That both Beechinors

mishandled the matter seems obvious, with inept and heavy-handed interventions. That the Bishop himself stayed out of the debate, is also apparent, as are the general indications that the clergy did not rush to his defence in print. From the *Mercury*, it could well be imagined that the matter had blown over by the end of March, for nothing further is published about it. It is from the Joseph Roper letters that it becomes apparent that the matter dragged on till 1880 at least, when the young Fr Roper went to Adelaide, rather than return to his native Tasmania, because of fears that he would be implicated in the affair. Indeed, it was not till June 1882 that he transferred to the diocese, and was stationed at Stanley. Could one be forgiven for wondering if this was about as far away as his Bishop could send him? It certainly was far from the family he so wished to return to.

In this whole sorry matter, the Bishop's inability to correct a mistake stands out. His preference for his own nephews, in the face of solid opposition from his other priests, underscores a stubbornness that may have caused accusations against him of exercising the episcopal absolutism so prominent among the Irish bishops on the mainland. Indeed, the presence of two of them - Crane and Murray - in the church when this whole deplorable affair of the illicit threat to excommunicate began, lends weight to the idea that some tenets of the absolutism referred to above, must have been at stake in the quarrel with *The Tasmanian Standard*. Why did Dr Murphy act so irrationally with regard to Roper's paper? It has been shown that the reasons he advanced for losing confidence in the "editorial management" of Joseph Roper were not sustained by research in the *Tasmanian Catholic Standard*, Version II, or in the letters to the *Mercury*. A conversation that the writer had with Professor Austin Gough, a descendant of Joseph Roper, may provide an answer. Professor Gough suggests that the Irish Bishop disapproved of Joseph Roper because he was English, because he was a layman in charge of a Catholic paper, and because he was a layman well-versed in theology. In support of such a claim, it can be appreciated that Dr Murphy certainly demanded clerical control of Catholic papers, and could well have shared the general conviction of the Irish bishops on the mainland, that the Australian Church had to be cleansed of the English character stamped on it by Polding and Willson, and re-made in a thoroughly Irish manner.<sup>89</sup> Such a mind-set resulted in the

---

<sup>89</sup> O'Farrell, *CC&C*, p 194.

"law-making" habits of the Irish bishops, who "codified" Australian Catholicism.<sup>90</sup> Bishop Murphy certainly tried to use "law" against *The Catholic Standard*, and its readers. This at least provides a rationale for the Bishop's actions.

There are no further indications in either press as to how long Bishop Murphy maintained his opposition to Roper's paper. By June of 1879, a new issue arose which was to unite the Bishop and his flock, and may have had the happy effect of putting this matter of the excommunications behind them. Such may have been the blessing brought to a divided diocese by Pastor Chiniquy, to be treated shortly.

In concluding this section on the Catholic press, another reason for the ready acceptance of the 'rogue' paper, beyond the skills and integrity of its editor as a leading Catholic, and its general readability over the 'authorised' version, was the Papal endorsement that it carried. Apparently Fr Joseph Roper had presented the Pope with a bound copy of the paper, and the Pope had caused a letter to be written to the editor, expressing his appreciation, good wishes and blessing. This occurred about the time of the break with the Bishop. The Roper-Shirley paper notes on p 24, in the Feb 1880 edition, that "Pope Leo XIII sends a Special Blessing to the Catholic Standard, after accepting a bound volume of the paper, presented to him." Following this, a writer of a letter to the editor suggested that it be printed in each succeeding edition. This was done. Over the Leader masthead, are printed two quotes from Pope Pius IX, and one from Pope Leo XIII's letter, blessing writers of Catholic journals, who defend the cause of religion, and blessing this particular journal specifically. As his flock knew that Bishop Murphy was a strong supporter of the embattled Pope, they could be forgiven for failing to be convinced by his opposition to this Catholic paper, which was approved of by that same Pope!

Dr Murphy's civic role in the colony is a little more clearly documented in at least two significant instances. Both concern incidents when he co-operated with the Governor of the day to ensure civil peace. The Bishop was well received at Government House, and was frequently a guest there, where his lively humour and natural courtesy were appreciated.<sup>91</sup> The *Mercury* frequently reports his vice-regal connections. That of Saturday, 16 January,

---

<sup>90</sup> Campion, Edmund, *Rockchoppers*, Penguin Books, Melbourne, 1982, p 60.

<sup>91</sup> ADB, p 316.

1869, reports his presence at the swearing in of Governor Du Cane, and he is placed immediately after Bishop Bromby in precedence. On Thursday, 6 January, 1876, the then Governor Weld and his Lady were present at the Presentation Convent Bazaar, as its patrons, and the Bishop was in attendance. For Government House Levees, Dr Murphy is mentioned, with Bishop Bromby, at the head of the list of "Gentlemen with the Right of Private Entry."<sup>92</sup> This familiarity with the mores of colonial government seems to confirm an outlook of Murphy's, that he held a responsible office in the realm of a Protestant monarch, to whom he owed loyalty in all things that needed to be rendered to Caesar. He accepted that the good of his Church in the colony required this attitude, and in his pastorals he had been at pains to ensure that Catholics would be accepted as loyal subjects of the Empire, with a duty to defend it and a right to share in its bounty and protection. His arguments for a just share of the education vote were based on these assumptions. Murphy was not alone among Victorian-age Catholic prelates in Australia in adopting this stance. The Pastoral of the Second Provincial Council, 1869, was strong in this matter, as was that of the Third Plenary Council of 1905. The anti-Empire strain in Catholicism was not yet apparent.

In his first complete year in the colony Bishop Murphy persuaded the participants to cancel the St Patrick's Day Dinner, 1868, at the request of Governor T Gore Brown, after Prince Alfred was shot in Sydney "by a madman named O'Farrell."<sup>93</sup> The new Bishop's ability to persuade those looking forward to a fine celebration, which contained the elements of a statement of their identity in a society that tried often to discount that very identity, gives a good indication of his persuasive powers, his ability to charm, and the respect in which his office was held. The Governor and his staff were grateful and impressed.

The *Mercury* of Wednesday, 18 March, 1868, was stridently anti-Irish in commenting upon the issue. The editorial declared that the prince had been shot by a Fenian, that an organised system of assassination was part of this plot, and graphically described how twenty-four men drew lots to see who had the honour of firing the shots. There was obviously a nest of conspirators to be tracked down. The murderer must "suffer with his

---

<sup>92</sup> The *Mercury*, Monday, 22 May, 1876.

<sup>93</sup> Beechinor, *Memoir*, p 37.



life," as "no plea can be put in. . . . Away with the fellows! They are not fit to live!"

The following day,<sup>94</sup> the *Mercury* told of a public meeting attended by Bishop Murphy, Bishop Bromby and other community leaders to express sympathy with the prince. The same paper also reported the cancelling of the St Patrick's dinner and the role of the Bishop in this. On Friday, 20 March, the *Mercury* editorialised on the public meeting, reporting that Bishop Murphy had stated that he concurred with the sympathy expressed by others, and remarking that "the laws of God command obedience to our Sovereign," which sentiment was met with "prolonged applause." Monday, 23 March, brought reports of the Sunday church services which had prayed for the recovery of the prince. In his Cathedral, Dr Murphy had expressed "sympathy with the Royal sufferer,"<sup>95</sup> and wished his condolences to be conveyed to the Queen. He mentioned and condemned Fenianism, and tied it to Italian nationalism, which sought the overthrow of "both Christianity and monarchy." He reminded his hearers that Fenianism had been outlawed by the Irish bishops, and he warned his flock against anarchy, both here and abroad. The final appearance of this controversy was in the *Mercury* of Saturday, 4 April, when the editor reflected on the guilty verdict against O'Farrell, speculated that he would confess to a priest prior to execution, but warned their readers that this would not be made public because of Catholic rules governing the Confessional. They closed the report by assuring readers that every Catholic was not a Fenian.

The second incident concerns the visit to Hobart Town by Pastor Chiniquy, a French Canadian apostate priest, who was touring the colonies at the invitation of the Orange Order to lecture against Catholicism. This occurred in June, 1879, at a time when the temperature of the sectarian debate was rising because of the secular education issue, and the Catholic Church's insistence, orchestrated by the Irish bishop clique in NSW and Queensland, against the hitherto soft option of the late Polding and Willson and the Irish Goold, on mixed marriages. "The clerical crusade against mixed marriages did much to intensify and sustain sectarian conflict; it was a constant source of specific difficulty and particular

---

<sup>94</sup> The *Mercury*, 19 March, 1868.

<sup>95</sup> The same terminology as he used in his Pastoral on the subject.

abrasion of a day-to-day kind, at the level of ordinary people." <sup>96</sup> A campaign had been waged and won by the Irish bishops prior to and at the Second Provincial Council of 1869. Since then, with the Council Pastoral and decrees, there had been resistance from the laity in this matter, as they were much more comfortable with the "English" bishops' approach. O'Farrell is sure that "the laity did not obey in any way completely directives" about mixed marriages. <sup>97</sup> The constant need in the future for bishops to "regularise" illicit marriages contracted before Protestant ministers is proof of this.

The *Mercury* reflected this community distrust in its editorials. In the edition for Wednesday, 25 June, 1879, they told their readers that the paper had no views on Chiniquy, but that they objected to "a body of men" preventing his meeting from proceeding in the Town Hall the previous evening. The editorial then roundly slated the "cowardice of the police." They were referring to the fact that a mob of Catholics had occupied the Town Hall that evening and prevented the meeting. The police Superintendent Propsting had been unwilling to try to move them out, as it had been advertised as a public function and he had witnessed no breach of the peace. The organising committee then decided to abort the meeting.

On Tuesday, 24 June, the *Mercury* published a letter from Henry Hunter regretting the use of the Town Hall for "libels" on his religion, and commenting upon the report in the paper on Monday, of Pastor Chiniquy's claims in the Chalmers Church, on idolatrous "worship" of a wafer by Catholics. The following day, the Rev R MacLaren Webster replied to Henry Hunter, asking for evidence of the Pastor's attacks on the Catholic Church. He asks Hunter to examine Chiniquy's claims in the light of Bible teaching, and remonstrated that he himself heard nothing from the Pastor which attacked Catholics by way of libel. He reminds Hall that the English tradition of free speech means that there is no problem in relation to the use of the Town Hall. "Liberty" writes next, asking Henry Hunter to "disprove in a manly way" the claims that Chiniquy is making. He comments that the colony was a place of peace between the Christian denominations till now, and he deprecates Chiniquy's arrival and reception by his fellow Protestants.

---

<sup>96</sup> O'Farrell, *CC&C*, p 205.

<sup>97</sup> O'Farrell, *CC&C*, p 205.

News items were prominent in the edition for Thursday, 26 June, on rumours in the town about last Tuesday night's happenings at the Town Hall. Most people, it was stated, disapprove of a crowd forcing its will on others. The police had failed. A riot was feared tonight if the Protestants take counter measures. A Chiniquy Committee meeting with the mayor is reported too, and their request for sufficient police to enable their meeting tomorrow evening to go ahead. A report followed, on the Committee, after meeting the mayor, holding a meeting to organise defences for Friday night. Two hundred young Protestant men had been promised and would be organised for action at 4.00 pm today. There followed accounts in much fuller detail of happenings at the Town Hall last Tuesday. On Thursday, 26 June, the *Mercury* also published a letter from Dr ES Hall, which it had decided not to publish the previous day, but would now do so out of respect for the Catholic layman. Hall set out Catholic objections to Chiniquy's assertions about them, namely, that Catholics were not idolaters, that they believed totally in the unique saving action of the death and resurrection of Christ, and he invited any person to check in the popular Catholic prayer book, *The Garden of the Soul*, to see these beliefs set forth.

The *Mercury* of Friday, 27 June, ran a large advertisement of the meeting in the Town Hall at 7.30 pm, when the Pastor will speak on "Liberty of Conscience." Just above the editorial, the paper ran the notice from Dr Murphy, which is quoted in the following paragraph. It was preceded by a notice from the military commandant to all members of the Southern Tasmanian Volunteer Artillery and the Volunteer Rifles, to mobilise tomorrow evening at 7.00 pm. Both these last two notices were commented upon approvingly by the editorial. News items commented on the disturbances to date, and demanded strong police action. Special constables must be enrolled. A Catholic deputation to the mayor is reported as occurring yesterday, and the paper states that after tonight, all future meetings of the pastor should be held in Protestant churches. The Catholic meeting, to be held on the Domain at 6.00 tonight, is also reported, as is a meeting of the City Council, which decided to enrol special constables at 4.00 pm today.

Into this mix of intra-confessional ill-feeling, and cross-confessional misunderstanding and suspicion, a spark like Chiniquy threatened an explosion capable of making the colony ungovernable. The Governor had authorised the reading of the Riot Act, the mobilisation

of the military, and had appealed to Dr Murphy to use his good offices with his own people. After the event, Governor FA Weld reported to the Home Secretary as follows:- "Whilst these arrangements (the Proclamation mobilising the local military forces) were being made and carried out by the civil power, the Most Reverend Daniel Murphy, Bishop of Hobart Town, was gradually rendering them unnecessary, . . . He issued the following address, which appeared in the morning papers:-

To the Catholics of Hobart Town. - Seeing that your efforts to prevent the City Council letting the Town Hall to the purpose to which it has been devoted this week have failed, and being informed that further demonstrations on your part, in that direction, will be resisted by the force of law - leading probably to rioting and bloodshed - I most earnestly request that you will have the good sense to abstain from making any further attempts to vindicate, on the present occasion, your rights as citizens and ratepayers, and to absent yourselves from the precincts of the Town Hall this evening. My only object in thus appealing to you is to prevent injury to persons and property, and to induce you to show your respect for yourselves as Catholics and loyal citizens.

+ Daniel Murphy, Bishop of Hobart Town."

The Governor continues "Still a large number of persons, many of them I am assured armed with revolvers and other weapons, did meet in the Domain at night-fall; but the Bishop with his clergy and several laymen of position, came upon the ground, and finally persuaded the crowd to forego their intention of marching upon the Town Hall, and they ended by escorting the Bishop's carriage through other main streets of the city to his residence. Some 3,000 people . . . were present when the Bishop gave them his blessing and thanks for thir (sic) obedience to his advice, dismissed them to their homes, and the crowd, after giving vent to both loyal and religious feelings in cheers, peacefully dispersed. It is noteworthy that no cry was heard or word uttered offensive to Protestants as a body." This report is dated 7th July, 1879. <sup>98</sup>

In this incident, Bishop Murphy deserved the plaudits of the civil power. He had been the only religious leader capable of removing one entire side from the looked-for confrontation.

---

<sup>98</sup> Beechinor, *Memoir*, pp 39-42.

That again he was listened to by what must have included the hottest heads in his flock, should now be put squarely to his own credit. He had now been in the colony and in possession of his See for thirteen years, long enough for him and his people to know and appreciate their respective strengths and weaknesses. The ugliness of the *Standard* dispute was a year old, and showing no sign of diminishing. The threats of excommunication, if not the act thereof, had been reported in Roman circles since last May. Yet, this bishop, beset by suspicions and accusations of nepotism, had been listened to by, and had convinced, a mob "armed with revolvers and other weapons . . . some 3,000 . . . people (who) were present when the Bishop gave them his blessing and thanks for their obedience . . . (and) dismissed them to their homes . . . peacefully dispersed."

The *Mercury* of Saturday, 28 June, had a long report under the headline "Pastor Chiniquy." The "extreme element of the Roman Catholics would have had a riot." The "intelligent element" and the Roman Catholic Bishop induced them to listen to reason, "and no disturbance took place." Because the Bishop and the Clergy, "who worked all day at persuasion," went to the Domain at 6.00 pm, the crowd "though evidently unwilling, was mollified and acted upon the good advice. The public will congratulate the Bishop and Clergy." There were plaudits also for the government and City Council. The swearing in of the special constables had proved to be unnecessary. The paper reports that many of those 250 enrolled at 4.00 pm the previous day had proved unsuitable, and 150 "reliable citizens" had been called up by summons from the mayor. The feared Catholic reinforcements had not materialised, but the Railway and the Coach Line were condemned for agreeing to carry them to the capital. The mobilisation of the military was reported in full - a total of 439 men under arms. Finally, a Catholic protest meeting in St Joseph's School was held prior to the Bishop's visit to the Domain. A letter of thanks from the mayor to Dr Murphy is mentioned for his notice in yesterday's paper. A report of the Bishop's speech in the domain then followed. The crowd cheered the Bishop on his arrival and he agreed to wait for late-comers to arrive before speaking. He was accompanied by Frs Dunne, M Beechinor, and O'Reilly, and Dr Hall, Mr Hunter, and Mr Roper. Frs Hennebry and Gilleran were already there. The Bishop waited till 6.30, and was introduced by Dr Hall. There were spirited interjections throughout Dr Murphy's speech.

He began, "My dear friends," and spoke of the "extraordinary provocation," and their "outraged feelings" in seeing their religion "vilified." He mentioned "the years of peace in Hobart Town with all denominations. . . . You have already vindicated your rights as citizens," and he assured them that "any move on the Town Hall tonight will be completely destroyed. I beg you not to assemble at or to approach the Town Hall. I fear there will be bloodshed." He appealed to Daniel O'Connell's words that "'nothing is worth the shedding of blood.' I ask as your pastor, your friend, I know you will go to your homes quietly." The report continues that the majority agreed, although some few dissented. The crowd asked permission to escort the Bishop home, and promised then to disperse. It was a cheerful and cheering procession. After receiving his blessing, the crowd cheered "the Bishop, the Clergy, the Queen and Ireland." They went to their homes.

No Bishop is perfect, but those whose love and service of their people are obvious, are forgiven a multitude of faults, even sins. Murphy, "nephew-ridden," capable of unfair and even unjust judgment and action, even "autocratic, stubborn and devious," <sup>99</sup> was respected by those who heard him in the darkness of that night. They obeyed, not because he might excommunicate them who could remain anonymous in the crowd and the darkness, but because he was convincing, because his office was worthy of their respect, because they were moved to accept him as their leader, their chief. Such was one aspect of the man who governed the Church in Tasmania for forty-one years.

The last aspect of Bishop Murphy revealed by the records that remain was his love of science, specifically of astronomy. In this field, he was recognised by his fellows as competent at the highest inter-colonial levels. Dr Murphy was a Fellow of the Royal Society of Tasmania. <sup>100</sup> The *Mercury* of Wednesday, 10 May, 1876, reports his election to that rank. He delivered a paper at a meeting of the Australasian Association for the Advancement of Science, held in Hobart in 1892, <sup>101</sup> on the subject of "Solar Phenomena

---

<sup>99</sup> ADB, p 316.

<sup>100</sup> 1892 'Report of the Royal Society of Tasmania' published in *Papers and Proceedings of the Royal Society of Tasmania*, 1891-93, p 8.

<sup>101</sup> *Report of the Fourth Meeting of AAAS held at Hobart, Tasmania, in January, 1892*, p 261.

and their Effects." This was not a one-off event, for the ageing Archbishop headed for Brisbane for the next meeting of the Australasian Association for the Advancement of Science, and there delivered a paper entitled "Efficiency in Solar Heating." <sup>102</sup>

Dr Murphy had his private observatory in his house. His telescope is preserved in the Archives of the Presentation Sisters at Blackmans Bay. This picture of the theologian-scientist is another aspect of the complex personality that is obscured by his burning of his personal records. And so, that question needs to be asked - why did he destroy his records? For the theologian and seeker after Christian perfection, the question is more easily answered. The conventional ascetical theology would urge that here we have no permanent city, that all is passing away, and that the Christian should have his treasure in Heaven and be unattached to the things of earth. Such motives, normative to religious life, may have motivated the Archbishop, as he approached the end of his long life. <sup>103</sup>

---

<sup>102</sup>ADB, p 316.

<sup>103</sup> Another suggestion comes from the Presentation Sisters, who knew those of their Order who had been with the dying prelate in their holiday house at Low Head, where he had gone to rest and recover. There is a story among these nuns that the Archbishop burned all records that could disclose the convict origins of his people. Professor Austin Gough, a descendant of Joseph Roper, has also told the writer that Bishop Murphy destroyed some of the Willson papers during his long episcopate. Such an action may add substance to this story of the nuns.

### **Old Age and Death**

Because Bishop Murphy ruled the diocese for forty-one years, it tends to be forgotten that he arrived in the colony at fifty-one years of age, already twenty-one years a bishop. None of his young years was spent here. He was sixty-six years old when he re-opened the cathedral, and this was at a time when the affair of the excommunications had died publicly, judging from the end of the series of letters to the *Mercury*. The last of these appeared almost three years previously, in March, 1878. That the issue was still simmering, at least in the Roper family, is attested by the continuing stay of Fr Joseph Roper in Adelaide.

The *Mercury* reported the re-opening of the Cathedral in their issue of Monday, 24 January, 1881. It contained no hint of lingering or simmering bitterness at large. Special trains and coaches brought huge crowds for the occasion. The building was designed to seat 800-1000 and is described appreciatively by the reporter as a fine addition to Hobart's buildings. An impressive attendance of politicians and leading colonial gentry is reported. Visiting prelates included the Bishop of Sandhurst (Dr Crane - who had been present at the "Excommunication" speech of Fr John Murphy at Honeywell), and the Bishop of Bathurst (Dr Matthew Quinn). The Bishop of Brisbane (his brother James), had taken sick en route, in Sydney.

In the Presentation School, at a luncheon held for the dignitaries after the re-opening ceremony, Mr CH Bromby, MHA, proposed the Bishop's health, acknowledging the liberality and good feeling towards him of both non-Catholics and Catholics. This was a just recognition of his "good nature and high character" and his "generous treatment of differing opinions." He mentioned his untiring energy, unusual in a man of his years, and concluded with the affirmation that "he would live in the hearts of his people."

The next significant mention of Dr Murphy in the *Mercury* concerned his elevation to the style and dignity of Archbishop. Throughout the latter half of 1888, he is referred to as the "Archbishop Designate," in all public descriptions in the *Mercury*. In 1889, preparations for the arrival of the Cardinal Archbishop of Sydney, Patrick Moran, and the party of visiting prelates are reported regularly under the heading of "Cardinal's Committee." On Friday, 10 May, the *Mercury* reports that the Cardinal, Archbishop Reynolds (Adelaide),



and three other bishops, have arrived from Melbourne and will travel from Launceston by the express. On Saturday, 11 May, the paper records the reception of the Cardinal and accompanying prelates at the Hobart Railway Station. Led by the band, the guests were conveyed by carriages to St Mary's Cathedral, along "densely crowded streets." In excess of 3000 crowded into the Cathedral for addresses of welcome to the visitors, which highlighted the "zealous services of the Archbishop" to his people over long years. Moran replied with thanks, and a tribute to "the venerable prelate . . . a model for them all . . . devoted to his people."

The *Mercury* of Monday, 13 May, reported the ceremony of the bestowal of the Pallium. There was standing room only in the Cathedral. Governor Hamilton and his lady headed the long list of civil dignitaries, and they were seated in the sanctuary with the clergy, exercising the ancient right of a ruling prince. A long procession of prelates and clergy entered, with the Cardinal and Dr Murphy at its end. The sanctuary was crowded with representatives of bishops unable to attend themselves, and the Tasmanian clergy. After mass, the Cardinal asked for the Papal brief to be read by the Dean, Rev Daniel Beechinor. He did so, in Latin, and Dr Murphy then asked him to read an English translation. The Pope intended "to raise the Episcopal See of Hobart to the dignity of a Metropolitan See," and to raise his beloved Brother Daniel, holder of the See, to the dignity of Archbishop. The Cardinal invested the kneeling Archbishop with the Pallium, and seated him on his throne, where he received the homage of his own clergy. The speeches stress the refrain of Murphy's devotion to his people, and the love they have for him. The acclaim of his people is fully reported. There are no letters on the event that strike any sour notes. Again, the picture is one of a venerated and loved father in God.

The *Mercury* of 12 December, 1893, reported the consecration of Dr Patrick Delany as Coadjutor Bishop of Hobart, with the right of succession. Dr Murphy attended this event in the cathedral at Ballarat. He was now seventy-nine, and this consecration must have been a disappointment of his hopes that Daniel Beechinor would succeed him.

The next major event to be featured in the *Mercury* is the 1896 jubilee of his episcopal ordination. The paper of the following day had the arrival of Cardinal Moran, and other prelates, at Government House as the guests of Viscount and Viscountess Gormanston.

On Saturday, 24 October, the *Mercury* reported the arrival of Archbishop Carr of Melbourne and three other bishops.

On Monday, 26 October, a full report of the proceedings filled the paper. There was "great rejoicing" in the Cathedral, and the congregation represented almost all denominations in Hobart. The Governor and his wife headed the civil guest list, followed by Premier Braddon, the chief Justice, Cabinet Ministers, and Members of Parliament. Heads of state departments and city dignitaries were mentioned in the long guest list.

In the sanctuary with the clergy were the Governor and his wife, the visiting prelates, and the Cardinal and Dr Murphy. After mass, the Cardinal preached a long sermon, setting out Dr Murphy's long life, and stressing the generosity, the giving of self to others and the love and respect of the Catholic and non-Catholic people for him. He mentioned Murphy's long rule of a diocese that was established when the sees represented by most other bishops present were but villages, and which was second only to Sydney in age. Luncheon followed in the Presentation School, and the Governor presided. He made an address to the Archbishop, again stressing the themes mentioned by the Cardinal. The Archbishop then replied with "visible emotion." He directed credit for all of his achievements to those who were his helpers. He thanked the non-Catholic community for their generous support of his Cathedral, church building and the Catholic schools. He then reflected on the generosity of his Catholic people, their loyalty and love shown to him, and the dedication and support to himself of his priests. After lunch, the party returned to the Cathedral for a series of addresses to the Archbishop. In reply to these, the Archbishop broke down several times. It was announced that there would be a "conversazione" that night in the Town Hall for the visiting prelates and clergy.

The Archives contain an item bearing on Dr Murphy's old age, which was sent to Dr Guilford Young, from LJ Hooker Ltd. It was a cutting from a 1903 paper, found when demolishing a house. It is headlined

#### NOW THE OLDEST LIVING PRELATE

##### Hobart's Archbishop

It was published to mark his 88th birthday, when the death of Leo XIII left him with this distinction.

The next major item on the Archbishop is his death notice and funeral report in the *Mercury* of Wednesday, 1 January, 1908. He had died at Low Head on 29 December, and the body had lain in state in his Church of the Apostles at Launceston.<sup>104</sup> It was then conveyed to Hobart in a special van on the mail train. The coffin had been met at the Hobart Station by a great crowd and it had moved in procession to his Cathedral where his priests "received the remains of their beloved Archbishop." The Office of the Dead was recited by all priests of the Archdiocese, Archbishop Elect Delany presiding.

The Cathedral was crowded. The Governor and Lady Strickland headed the list of mourners, accompanied by Premier Evans, State and Federal parliamentarians, Commander of the Military Forces, the Anglican Bishop, and representatives of the Methodist and Congregational Churches. Dr Delany celebrated requiem mass, and Fr Gilleran preached, announcing that there would be no eulogy today, but this would be reserved for a 'national' service in Hobart at the end of the month. He thanked all for the many public expressions of sympathy. The ceremony proceeded to the internment in the burial chamber of the new Cathedral. Archbishop Delany was then installed on the Archbishop's throne, after the reading of the Papal brief appointing him "by right of succession."

The *Mercury* of Thursday, 30 January, reported that, on the previous day, Dr Delany had presided at a Solemn Office of the Dead for the late Archbishop, in the presence of Archbishop Carr of Melbourne, and four other bishops. The Governor, Lord Strickland, attended with the Premier and Members of Parliament. Fr O'Mahony preached, beginning that "our hearts were too full to speak at the funeral." He painted a picture of the Archbishop as a man of prayer. Only the priests who lived with him knew how little he slept, as he was often found praying long into the night. He was one who lived for his God and his people. He spoke of the many acts of kindness of the Archbishop, and the love that this aroused in the people he served. The packed Cathedral listened and sobs could be heard.

The next Archive item is also a newspaper cutting.<sup>105</sup> From a Tasmanian Catholic paper,

---

<sup>104</sup> This was an episcopal church, run for the Archbishop by an Administrator.

<sup>105</sup> CA 6/MUR 35 From a Tasmanian Catholic paper, not named or dated, an obituary.

not named or dated, an obituary. The reverse side of the cutting has part of the Catholic Church calendar, which enables the dating of the publication to January, 1908, following the Archbishop's death in December, 1907. Its headlines are in the best traditions of the Victorian age:

Death of the Archbishop  
The Nestor of the World's Episcopate  
Sixty-nine Years a Priest:  
Sixty-one Years a Bishop.

It then continues ". . . the veteran has passed away with his harness on his back. . . . His name was held in respect and veneration not only by his own people, but also by those who did not worship before the altars at which he ministered. This was evidenced each succeeding year when men of all classes and creeds waited upon him to tender to him hearty birthday congratulations. "

The final items bearing directly on the Archbishop are his Will and the deed of Probate.<sup>106</sup> He made small bequests ranging from £20-£250 to fund priests for the archdiocese, for the work of the convents, to his house-keeper and to the poor of Hobart. The residue of some £2000 was to found his long-wished-for seminary. His nephews did not benefit from the will. He left his pectoral cross and library to his successors in the see. The Church of Hobart was the beneficiary of the Archbishop's will, a Church he had served for forty-one years.

---

<sup>106</sup> CA 6/MUR 33 Probate document and copy of Archbishop's will.

### Conclusion.

In evaluating the long episcopate of Daniel Murphy, his fallible human nature is apparent. However, there is no evidence in the remaining records that Daniel Murphy was closely associated with the mainland Irish bishops James and Matthew Quinn, James Murray, Timothy O'Mahoney and William Lanigan, in their campaign of undermining Archbishop Polding by an avalanche of letters to Rome. In all references to the Archbishop, Murphy is respectful and seems affectionate towards him. When writing on Church councils in 1874,<sup>107</sup> he is generous in his appreciation of Polding's long labours in the Province.

That he was involved in intrigue within his own diocese seems beyond dispute. The sorry tale of the "Battle of the Standards" shows the Bishop in an unfavourable light, and justifies the description of him as "autocratic, stubborn and devious."<sup>108</sup> There is no record that the Bishop ever publicly admitted misjudgment or worse in this affair. That he was involved in and part of the continuing scandal is also obvious, for his other actions show him to be too intelligent, and too clearly in charge of the affairs of the diocese, simply to be a pawn in the hands of his nephews. The allegation of stubbornness would explain his failure to retreat gracefully from a situation in which he was destined to lose. The charge of the nephews hiding behind their uncle, made in the letters to the *Mercury*, may well be the reverse of the truth. Perhaps a determined Bishop hid behind the two priests who fought the losing fight on his behalf, and decided to let the opprobrium of the Catholic people of Tasmania fall on them, rather than on himself.

That people forgave this Bishop his faults is also a matter of record, and supports the claim that he was "courteous,"<sup>109</sup> and attractive to others. He was appreciated, and accepted by the Governors and legislators of the colony, written of respectfully by the media, co-operated with by some other Church leaders such as Bishop Bromby, but, above all, honoured by his co-religionists. None of the critics attack the Bishop directly in the *Standards'* dispute. He became the hero and protector of Catholics in the Chiniquy disturbances, and all public reports have him feted and honoured as he advanced in age.

---

<sup>107</sup> CA 6/MUR 21 A&B Pastoral for Lent, 1874, by 'the Bishop of Hobart Town.'

<sup>108</sup> ADB, p 316.

<sup>109</sup> ADB, Vol 5, p 316.

The outpourings of public emotion during his celebrations, and especially at his death, attest to the high regard in which he was held by non-Catholics as well as Catholics. That he was respected by many in the society in which he lived is evidenced by the celebrations of 1888, which saw his See raised to metropolitan status, and which was celebrated by the whole province and by the colonial authorities. The newspaper report <sup>110</sup> on him as the oldest prelate alive, in his 88th year, referred to the love in which he was held by his people. "For some 37 years he has presided over the Church in that State in a manner which has won him the love and devotion of all his people." His obituary <sup>111</sup> also refers to the respect of non-Catholics, and the regard of those he served. ". . . the veteran has passed away with his harness on his back. . . . His name was held in respect and veneration not only by his own people, but also by those who did not worship before the altars at which he ministered. This was evidenced each succeeding year when men of all classes and creeds waited upon him to tender to him hearty birthday congratulations. . . . " This constant refrain of the love and respect that he evoked has to be balanced with the determined disapproval he also evoked over the matter of the *Standards*. However, his role as the founder of the Catholic press in Tasmania must not be lost sight of in the difficulties - even scandals - that its development entailed. That such events did not terminally injure his episcopate is to be wondered at, and gives substance to the claims made that he was attractive to and engaging of others. <sup>112</sup>

Dr Murphy's learning in the area of theology has been mentioned. Added to this is his expertise in astronomy, accepted at the two inter-colonial science congresses, his rôle as a practising astronomer in Hobart, and his Fellowship of the Royal Society of Tasmania. In view of this, it can be accepted that he was part of the intelligent and well-educated section of society, and that he continued this learning throughout his long life. He was obviously a great reader, quoting many world authorities on theology, Scripture, education and politics in his many pastorals.

Dr Murphy had his faults, as has been pointed out. He also appears to have grown in

---

<sup>110</sup> CA 6/MUR 34 From *The Catholic Press*, July 30, 1903, sent by RA of LJ Hooker Ltd, 50 Murray St, Hobart to Archbishop G Young.

<sup>111</sup> CA 6/MUR 35 From a Tasmanian Catholic paper, not named or dated, an obituary.

<sup>112</sup> ADB, p 316.

stature in his own diocese and on the national scene, becoming a prophet appreciated in his own country, because he truly served those he was appointed to rule.

---

**Appendix I**

**The Teaching of the Pastorals of Archbishop Murphy.**

By far the most significant material in the Archive's Murphy collection is his pastoral letters to the faithful of the diocese, regularly written prior to Lent each year. There are;

- ° 18 Lenten Pastorals preserved in full in their original state, or recovered from Catholic newspapers of the day, accounting for 18 of the 41 years of his rule in Hobart.
- ° 2 Pastorals from the Bishops of Australia in Council;
- ° 2 additional Pastorals issued to appeal
  1. for prayers for the beleaguered Pope, Italy and Poland, 1868; and
  2. for donations for the Indian famine, 1877.

It is clear that many of these Pastorals have not been preserved, if we assume that Bishop Murphy issued one each year. What remains does give us about 50% of the possible compositions by the Bishop. They constitute a resource of the ideas that he wanted to impart to his Church, the background to, and concepts that motivated him, the breadth of ideas that he was familiar with, and the causes that moved him to action. In these teaching documents, we get a hint of the measure of Murphy as a man, which his later destruction of his personal records was to obscure. Bishop Murphy comes up well from such a search, being seen as a very competent theologian, a strong supporter of a centralist Papacy, and a writer and teacher of great effectiveness.

**Introduction to Pastorals.**

Each pastoral begins, "Daniel, by the Grace of God, and Favour of the Apostolic See, Bishop of Hobart Town," and is addressed to the Clergy and Laity. Murphy is not at all consistent in the title by which he announces himself. Those to 1877 used 'Bishop of Hobart Town': in 1877 he used 'Hobarton', as Willson had always done, to open, and 'Hobart Town' to close; his second pastoral for this year was the same; in 1881, he uses 'Hobarton' to open and close, but gives the address as 'Hobart'; in 1882, he uses 'Hobarton' both times again. From then on, he uses 'Hobart'.

Most pastorals are written using the expression 'we', without the capital 'W'. This was a normal episcopal style of expression, common to Willson and other prelates of the time.<sup>113</sup> His second pastoral, in 1868, did use the 'Royal We' throughout. Such usage only occurs again, in one isolated instance, in his 1869 Lenten Pastoral. From then on, the Bishop does not capitalise. Perhaps colonial egalitarianism influenced him. All his pastorals begin with at least one attributed quotation from Scripture. Dr Murphy freely uses scriptural quotations throughout all his pastorals, and usually gives the book, chapter and verse. These are mostly accurately quoted, when one takes account of the version employed. He uses the Douay version of the Vulgate, and quotes Scripture in its literal sense, in all but one instance. He also uses Church documents freely, quoting Trent, Vatican I (after 1870!) and earlier councils, English and Irish pastorals, Roman documents, and thinkers of the time. All pastorals ended with his quoting 2 Cor 13. 13 - "The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, the love of God, and the fellowship of the Holy Ghost be with you all. Amen."

These writings of Dr Murphy are still resonant today with the concerns of his time, and in many ways they are still relevant for the Church and people of today. They are effective in communication terms, because of the Bishop's skill as a writer, and because he tackled themes that were at the core of the interests of his hearers on so many occasions. Let us now examine his pastorals in detail.

---

<sup>113</sup> See Dr Willson's letter to Dr Murphy, quoted in section 'Biographical Details.'



### **Pastoral for Lent, 1867 - the New Bishop's First.**

The new Bishop's first Pastoral was issued for Lent, 1867.<sup>114</sup> It could have been seen as a prudent start, keeping to the known of Lenten discipline in a new, and largely unknown diocese. He dealt with the reason the Church provides periods like Lent for her children. Fasting was explained, quoting Jonah and the Ninavites, John the Baptist, Christ in the desert, and the other two penitential practices, prayer and alms-giving, backed up with appeals to Tobit, Judith and Jesus. "Thus there are three spiritual weapons - fasting, alms and prayer." He continues, emphasising the necessity and utility of the sacraments of Penance and Holy Eucharist from Scripture. He tentatively talks of establishing a branch of the Society for the Propagation of the Faith in the diocese, which has supplied missionary funds to Hobart in the past, and he urges pastors to set it up in all areas, and families to join and support missionary endeavours, by contributing "one half-penny per week." He closes with an appeal to complete the work dear to the heart of the "late beloved Bishop and the lamented Vicar General" and announces an appeal throughout the diocese for £3000 to complete the Cathedral - the first St Mary's.

### **Pastoral for Lent, 1868.**

A year later, in his 1868 pastoral,<sup>115</sup> he opens quoting Joel 2. 17&23, "... the priests ... shall weep and say: 'Spare thy people ...' rejoice and be joyful ... He has given you a teacher of justice." He argues that the Church has inherited the teaching role from Christ, and her ordinances are a fence to protect the flock. He concentrates on two ordinances that are kept less well, demonstrating that he has learned from his year in the diocese: first, the Easter Duty for all Catholics to confess and receive Communion at least once a year; secondly, the prohibitions on worship with non-Catholics. He reminds them that this covers church-going, marriages, funerals and prayer in private dwellings. He warns parents of giving scandal to their children in this matter, quoting Matthew on scandalising little ones, and speaks of parents who consent to Protestants imparting religious education to their children as having "denied the faith" and "are worse than the infidel." (1 Tim 5. 8). In context, this verse refers to the support of parents and family in want, by those who can. It is the only example found of Dr Murphy not applying Scripture according to the context of the original writer, but he was to treat this text in this way more than once.

This hard line against religious fraternisation was new to the diocese. Some Irish clerics had criticised the English Bishops Willson and Polding for not taking a firmer line on mixed marriages in particular, and some of the push for Irish bishops, especially in Sydney, arose from this. Willson and his clergy had adopted the softer line, permitting mixed marriages to be celebrated in the church, before the altar, with due solemnity. This would tend to change under his successor, and must have had an effect upon the gradually increasing Protestant distrust of the Catholic Church that we see during this episcopate of Dr Murphy.

The bishop then deals with mixed marriages as such, quoting Pius IX, and mentions the declarations of past popes. He asks the clergy to explain this and he is sure that instructions, coming "from so high a source as the Head of the Catholic Church," will influence the conduct of the people.

### **Second Pastoral for 1868.**

---

<sup>114</sup> CA /6MUR 17.

<sup>115</sup> *The Tasmanian Catholic Standard*, February, 1868.

The second pastoral for 1868 is very short, <sup>116</sup> occasioned by the Encyclical of Pius IX, which is appended to the pastoral, in which "His Holiness describes the lamentable conditions into which the religious affairs of Italy and Poland are plunged, . . . he calls (all) to offer up their fervent prayers . . . (to) spare those afflicted countries."

The Bishop points out that Italy suffers "from the wickedness and impiety of her own people," and Poland "from the hostility of a foreign, tyrannical, and schismatical power, . . . yet in both places the overthrow of the Catholic Church is sought. Poland has won the admiration of Europe for her resistance to Russia."

Italy, the victim of a more deadly foe, viz., those secret societies, . . . "The organisation which these societies have matured is . . . the most dangerous to the best interests of society . . . Their emissaries are to be found everywhere. . . . they agitate incessantly, for in agitation consists the elements of success. . . . Seeing the Pope is the only one who constantly exposes their plots, . . . they concentrate all their efforts against Rome, . . . " hoping to force him from there. Bishop Murphy orders three days of prayer throughout the diocese for these causes, and appeals for increased contributions to support the Pope. In later pastorals he will tie the rise of secular education to the aims of these societies.

### 1869 Pastoral for Lent.

His 1869 Pastoral for Lent <sup>117</sup> is very interesting in that it follows upon the shooting of the Duke of Edinburgh in Sydney by a crazed Irishman. He briefly deals with Lenten duties, Sabbath Day observance, and holy days of obligation. He then starts on the main purpose, which is quoted as one of the examples of his fine writing style in Appendix III. The Bishop feared the rise of anti-Catholic feeling, but as the last pastoral demonstrated, may have contributed to it himself in some measure.

However, in this year, he must have recommended himself to the Governor and Legislature of the Colony, as he diffused a nasty moment by agreeing to persuade his people to abandon the St Patrick's Day dinner, as Governor Gore-Brown feared an attack upon it in the wake of the shooting of the Duke of Edinburgh. This will be treated fully in a later section, but it foreshadows the new Bishop's ability to work with the rulers of society, and his good relations with them.

### Provincial Council Pastoral, 1869.

The second pastoral for 1869 <sup>118</sup> comes from the Second Provincial Council of the Australian Church, assembled in Melbourne in April. Bishop Murphy attended as senior suffragan bishop from the second oldest see of the province, and signed immediately after the Metropolitan. This document was important for the Church in the emerging nation and was promulgated in all dioceses after Papal ratification. Its style throughout is similar to Dr Murphy's, and he refers to its teaching in future pastorals of his own. The Fathers of the Council begin "we are to you messengers and ministers of Christ." They then call for thanksgiving for the blessings that have flowed to the Australian Church. There are now 10 Sees in Australia, compared to the 3 that were in existence at the time of the First Provincial Council, (commencing 10 September, 1844, and attended by Archbishop Polding, Sydney, Bishop Willson, Hobarton, and Bishop Francis Murphy of Adelaide, who had been consecrated in Sydney by Polding and Willson 2 days before; 34 priests also attended.) These are times of trial. Two dangers are:-

<sup>116</sup> *The Tasmanian Catholic Standard*, August, 1868.

<sup>117</sup> CA 6/MUR 18.

<sup>118</sup> CA 6/MUR 30.

infidelity and indifferentism - almost the deadlier mischief of the two - are spreading with disastrous rapidity in the old world; they will find a very hotbed amongst us here prepared for their poisonous growth. So much disruption of old ties that checked self-will and aided conscience; such a commingling of classes in inverted positions; such a hot pursuit of wealth; such a watching for great gains; so little patient industry and content - ah! what advantages the Antichristian spirit has amongst us in all this added to the common corruption of our nature! What wonder if infidelity, which is the rejection of God's truth; - what wonder if indifferentism, which is the uprising of the spirit of Antichrist, lording it over God's truth by human opinion and choice; - what wonder if they spread their blight more rapidly and widely here than elsewhere?

Two special dangers flow from this - indifference in the education of the young in mixed schools, and indifference to mixed marriages. For the first, they declare that Catholic schools and teachers are necessary for Catholic children. The Pastoral then goes on to make the argument from natural justice: "Thus we suffer a privation of right which is no less a persecution than the infliction of a positive wrong; seeing that Catholics cannot, without detriment to conscience, avail themselves of the public schools, they are virtually deprived of the use of a portion of the funds voted for Education, and to which having, according to their numbers, contributed, they are justly entitled. They therefore suffer under a privation which is a grievous wrong, . . ."

On mixed marriages they said: "Seven years ago the Archbishop and the Bishops . . . addressed an earnest and affectionate warning to the faithful laity on the subject of mixed marriages. We are sorry to be obliged to confess that the admonition has not had the effect, full effect, which we hoped for, and which it ought to have had."

The Letter goes on to deplore the frequency of mixed marriages, which is "a terrible blot upon the character of the Catholic community. It is sad to think with what facility Catholic parents consent to such irreligious connections; with how little caution they expose their young people to social intercourse, where passionate fancy and the thoughtlessness of youth are certain to entail the danger of mischievous alliances."

It is in the main the fault of the parents more than of the children, who hear so little warning against mixed marriages - "so little denunciation and deprecation of their dangers and miseries." If they did hear, "The generosity itself of the young would revolt from such unions if they saw them in their true light - as a danger and a disgrace. Yes, a disgrace; not, perhaps, always in the eye of the world, but always in the eye of the Church."

They then compare the two views of matrimony. The church sees it as a Sacrament, in which God provides special grace for life together, where spouses are to be a mutual help and encouragement to each other. The world sees it as "A mere fanciful or passionate attachment, overlooking, or at least almost certainly undervaluing, the great considerations we have just stated. Is not this a disgrace?"

Indifferentism is the 'mother heresy' poisoning the children of mixed marriages. The clergy are called upon to place this teaching before the people. "The dispensation is not to be expected except for just and grave reasons; . . . and even when under these conditions the mixed marriage is permitted, there is to be no solemn benediction. The minister of the Church is to stand by, almost as a passive witness of an act which the Church has always deprecated and deplored." This new policy on mixed marriages, seen to be so much harsher than that pursued by Polding, Willson and Goold hitherto, was to be resented by

both Catholics and Protestants, and would become a factor in rising levels of sectarianism.

The Fathers of the Council then go on to outline the duty of the Church and society towards the Aborigines, and this section of the Pastoral is quoted in full as Appendix IV. It bears remarkably upon the debate today, which to some seems to encompass anew the idea of reconciliation. This document of 1869 seems surprisingly modern!

The last section of the Letter deals with the necessities of the Church in a young and growing country. The Fathers point out the responsibility that Australian Catholics have for this growth in a land requiring large expenditure and which has none of the large benefactions of older areas. Both clergy and people "have here their commission and responsibility . . . Both classes are to be a purifying principle of conservation in the world, a source of safety from corruption, both are to be a light shining amidst the darkness of heresy and infidelity, both are to manifest, that is, holiness and faith."

The Christian laity are to be salt and light to the world; the clergy are to be salt and light to the laity. The Fathers go on to remark that "the hearts of the dear laity are sound." Sanctity and humility are the weapons that this spiritual war against the mother of heresies, indifferentism, and her hand maiden, infidelity. "A great 'Benedicite' will rise to the throne of God our Saviour from this Australia, if Catholics betake themselves to these arms whenever they are minded to do service to God, and to be His instruments for extending the knowledge of divine charity amongst their fellow men."

This pastoral letter was signed by:

- + John Bede, OSB, Archbishop of Sydney.
- + Daniel, Bishop of Hobart Town.
- + James Alipius, OSA, Bishop of Melbourne.
- + James, Bishop of Brisbane.
- + Matthew, Bishop of Bathurst.
- + James, Bishop of Maitland.
- + Lawrence Bonaventure, OSF, Bishop of Adelaide.
- + William, Bishop of Goulburn.

It was dated 24 April, 1869.

In a later pastoral, 1874, the Bishop would mis-remember these statistics and hold that six council fathers attended.

### **1870 Lenten Pastoral.**

The 1870 Lenten Pastoral <sup>119</sup> was issued by Fr William Dunne, whom Murphy had appointed his Vicar-General, as the Bishop was absent attending the First Council of the Vatican. He opens with a relatively short section on Lent, and then moves to the Council and its magnificence, and is keen to convey the importance of the event by dwelling on the magnificence, and supplying some details of the event. This appears as Appendix V.

After the description of its opening, the words of Pius IX to the Council, are recorded in full, and the faithful are urged to offer their Lenten devotions for its deliberations. The Pastoral then returns to local concerns for the conclusion.

Parents are reminded that they must positively forbid the teaching of religion to their Catholic children in State schools, "for, in all cases in which Catholic parents omit, after receiving notice, to prohibit Protestant Teachers imparting religious instruction to their

---

<sup>119</sup> CA 6/MUR 19.

children, their omission is assumed as their express consent to have such religious instruction imparted, . . ."

The second local item concerns children "deserted by their dissolute parents or exposed to their evil example". Such parents are compared unfavourably to the "savage beasts", and a new venture, St Mary's Industrial School is announced, soon to commence, for "destitute female children", and funded by "our fellow Catholics of the other Australian colonies" who deemed it "a first necessity and duty."

**Letter to his Sister.**

The Bishop's responses to his attendance at the hastily terminated Council will be given in his next pastoral. Nothing remains of his personal correspondence on this, save a letter to his sister, preserved by her, and so escaping his bonfires. It is written from Ireland, where the Bishop went when the Council was unexpectedly adjourned. It sheds minimal light upon him, simply revealing him as a devoted brother to a sister whom he loved. It does give some insight into some bishops at the Council.

My dearest M Xavier,

I arrived here yesterday rather fatigued by my long passage from Rome but in good health thank God. Business will detain me here for some 8 or 10 (days) after which I shall proceed to the South taking in Fermoy on my way and seeing what is to be done there. Dr Keane on his way home kindly offered me his house whilst in that part of home whether he be at home or on his visitation. He was terribly prostrated by the heat of Rome before he left. So much so that he caused great anxiety to his friends. He improved however rapidly as he got into the cool regions and told me that he felt himself again as he was leaving Paris for Ireland. Dr McCabe, the Bishop of Ardagh died at Marseilles a victim to Roman heat and constant application to the business of the Council. His body was brought on to Paris where I and several Irish bishops had the melancholy consolation of attending his obsequies. Dr O'Mahony and Dr Croke went off yesterday for Moneraile.

The question of the Infallibility of the Pope was at length terminated on the 18th of July when the Holy Father solemnly pronounced its definition amid the enthusiastic demonstrations of the Fathers and the people who crowded the church. It was a great victory and one achieved by a special providence of God, for if the war had been declared a week sooner no one could tell what would have been the result of our most trying labours. Whether we can all assemble again in Rome next November as it was arranged is questionable in consequence of the withdrawal of the French troops from Rome and its being handed over to the merciful protection of Victor Emanuel (sic). Let us hope however for the better and continue to pray hard for the safety of the Holy Father and the church.

Although the Australian mail is in I have received no letter as yet from (Fr Dunne). This is the last day via Southampton. I shall write also by Marseilles in a few days more when I hope to receive some news from you. Give my love to all the Sisters and to (Vic Gen) Dunne.

My dearest M Xavier  
Your devoted Brother

---

+ Daniel Murphy. 120

This is the only personal letter of Bishop Murphy's that has been found, as there is none in the Catholic Archives.

### 1871 Lenten Pastoral.

The 1871 Lenten Pastoral <sup>121</sup> was issued by Bishop Murphy, and he takes the opportunity to reflect upon the Council. He opens with a reminder of the meaning of Lent, in two paragraphs, and then gets to the substance for this year: "In these days of wrath, calamity, and misery, we have to deplore the trials and sufferings which Divine Providence has permitted to fall upon His Church, and her Supreme Pontiff; and having subscribed to the sentiments which the Archbishops and Bishops of Ireland lately addressed to their flocks, we now make with them to you, the following protest against the outrages which have been perpetrated by King Victor Emmanuel against our Holy Father, Pope Pius IX:-"

(The Bishop then quotes the Irish Pastoral in full, adjusting it in parts to replace the word 'Ireland' with 'Tasmania.' A selection follows).

The words we address to you today, beloved brethren, come from hearts filled with sorrow and indignation. And how can it be otherwise, since we have to announce to you that our Holy Father, Pius IX, is a prisoner in the hands of his enemies? He has been robbed even of that personal liberty, which, as a sovereign, he had made secure for the very lowest of his subjects; he has been torn by brute force from his children, whose voices cannot reach his ear, and whom his words of guidance can no longer direct. And why has all this occurred? What excuse can be put forward by the men who have assailed God's anointed? What faults has Pius IX committed, whether as king or as pontiff, that this outrage should be inflicted upon him?

The Letter goes on to outline the achievements of Pius IX: First as king, "... 25 years on a throne held under the most sacred title, long a source of blessings to his people, who has used power gently, his rule prospered genius and the arts, he judged the poor lightly and ever sought to lighten their burdens, he supplied them with peace and plenty."

Then as Pope, "... it may be questioned if on that long and brilliant roll of Pontiffs there be found even one to surpass Pius IX. . . ." They set out the claims to greatness for Pius IX on the roll of Pontiffs:- that he erected many new Sees, restored Churches wasted by heresy, preserved the young by condemning evil systems of education, preached justice and truth to kings, defined the Immaculate Conception, canonised many saints, presided over the Vatican Council. Then the Irish bishops, and Bishop Murphy, continue: "And it was at this solemn moment, when the Catholic episcopate was gathered together to treat the most important subjects that can occupy men on earth, that a blow was struck at the visible head of the Church, and through him at the entire mystic body of Christ."

They comment that this was done by wicked men because he was good, as in the Book of Wisdom 2. 12-19: 'Let us lay traps for the upright man, since he annoys us and opposes our way of life . . . He claims to have knowledge of God, . . . boasts of having God for his father. Let us see if what he says is true, and test him to see what sort of end he will have. . . . Let us test him with cruelty and with torture . . . Let us condemn him to a shameful death since God will rescue him - or so he claims.' They then recommend a plan of action to the people: first, prayer for the Pope, joined to repentance for the sins of

---

<sup>120</sup> Letter dated 5 August, 1870 - Archives of the Presentation Sisters, Blackmans Bay.

<sup>121</sup> CA 6/MUR 20.

themselves and others. The Bishops then recommend worthy approaches to the Sacraments of Penance and the Eucharist, and that their prayers proceed from pure hearts and good works. Secondly, a protest to members of Parliament. They end with "Let it be our business to prove that their lies have not deceived anyone, and that Tasmania will joyfully take her place among the nations who will emulate one another in assisting, by their prayers and alms, the Vicar of Christ in this his hour of sore distress."

It appears that Bishop Murphy has inserted the name "Tasmania" here for the original "Ireland." The Pastoral goes on to ask the people not to be scandalised by "the momentary success that has attended the designs of the wicked." It quotes Wis. 2. 21-2, 4. 3-4, 10. 10, to foretell the overthrow of the invaders.

This pastoral is important as it would strike a chord with its hearers, Irish by blood, long looking to the Papacy as their protector in persecution, and attuned to the happenings in Rome by the reports to them of both Bishop Willson and Bishop Murphy. The natural sympathy of both the Irish and English Churches for their suffering Pontiff means that this statement of support for the Pope was significant in his struggle with the new Italian state.

### **Papal Reply to Bishop Murphy.**

This was reinforced when the Pope replied to Bishop Murphy directly in October of that year, thanking him and his people for the support they had offered to the Holy See. His letter <sup>122</sup> was read in all the churches:

Venerable Brother - health and Apostolic benediction. When we heard your words uttered in that remote land to uphold and defend the outraged rights of the Church, and of this Holy See, we recognised the glory of our holy religion of whose divine author it is written: 'He shall rule from sea to sea and from the river to the ends of the earth.' This noble concord of hearts and tongues which gets forcible expression even in the remotest shores of the world is clear evidence that the preaching of the Gospel has really penetrated into every land, and that it unites all mankind, however widely differing in manners, character and laws, into one family which, bound by the tie of mutual charity, and yielding obedience to one Supreme visible Head, not only reveres in that Head a divine authority, but also entertains for him a generous affection which not only rejoices in the honour and obedience which is paid to him, but is pained and indignant at his wrongs. This wonderful union of minds and hearts is the exclusive mark of the Catholic Church; and, as it finds strong expression in such widely sundered countries through the world, it is a clear proof of the vitality and vigour of the Church, and shows the folly of the machinations that are set on foot for its destruction. This unity gives glory to God, and is for Us a protection and consolation. . .  
Pius IX.

The possibility that Pius IX had written many such letters to many bishops world wide would not have distracted from the perception in this diocese that Dr Murphy was the Pope's man, and a champion of the oppressed pontiff in his hour of need. Murphy's people and clergy would have approved of this in their bishop.

### **The 1873 Lenten Pastoral.**

There is no 1872 pastoral in the Archives. It can only be assumed that it has been lost. The 1873 Lenten Pastoral <sup>123</sup> was written on the subject of education, which would become an

<sup>122</sup> CA 6/MUR 3.

<sup>123</sup> *The Tasmanian Catholic Herald*, 22 February, 1873, pp 115-6.

increasingly important issue as secular systems were arising in many parts of the world.

He begins by quoting Deut 4. 9: "Keep thyself, therefore, and thy soul carefully. Forget not the words that thy eyes have seen, and let them not go out of thy heart all the days of thy life. Thou shalt teach them to thy sons and grandsons." He points out that Moses told the Jews to study the words of God, and to "Teach what they saw and heard to their sons and grandsons. . . . So early, then, as at the time of Moses were clearly laid down those immutable principles, on which the education of Youth should be conducted." These principles have been passed through the prophets to the Church "which incessantly inculcates them in obedience to Christ's command to teach "all nations, teaching them to observe all things . . . (Matt 18. 19-20.)" [sic] correctly Matt 28. 19-20.

He mentions the "diversity of new systems of education, which have been . . . forced on Catholic peoples . . . The Church has adhered to . . . a system based on and guided by religion."

He refers to a meeting in St Joseph's Church last September in support of such a system. All were unanimous, and there was great depth of feeling expressed. A petition to Parliament was organised from all over the colony, and will be presented in the coming May. This affirms that education not guided by religion would be dangerous to the faith and morals of the children. This position was supported by quotations from authorities.

Pius IX was the first of these experts that he refers to. He was quoted and that quote ended with "The young, therefore, are exposed to the greatest perils whenever in the schools, education is not closely united with religious teaching." The Bishop continues:- "This is confirmed by Catholic and Protestant writers of note," and he quotes M. Guizot:- "in order to make popular education truly good and socially useful, it must be fundamentally religious. . . ."

Murphy expounds on irreligious education world wide. He quotes "the late Archbishop Whately" on the Irish education situation "deliberately states that it is gradually undermining the Irish Catholic Church. Cardinal Cullen and the Catholic Bishops of Ireland . . ." agree . So does Archbishop M'Closkey of New York, and Archbishop Manning of Westminster. The German Hierarchy are of the same opinion. All these sources are quoted. He continues: "The Communists of Paris have recently given the world a terrible example of what a people brought up without religion, and free to follow the bent of their passions, are capable of perpetrating. . . . nothing . . . escaped the fury of men who looked upon the living God as a myth, and their fellow creatures as irresponsible to a Supreme Judge of the living and the dead."

He goes on to wonder "that good men . . . can be so led astray by false lights." As we consist of souls endowed with will and intellect, "it is necessary for education . . . that both these faculties should be carefully cultivated." The intellect allows us to "attain knowledge of what is right and wrong." The will is "the seat of the passions and affections which are the source of moral good and evil. . . . To cultivate one of these faculties to the neglect of the other, is a radical defect . . . Religion . . . alone is capable of controlling the passions of the heart . . . " The aims of some men of power and influence, seeking to throw off all restraints of God's Law are mentioned. "Education is the means they adopt for carrying out their iniquitous design, . . ." The Church through her Pastors protests at this, and will continue to do so. It follows that ' . . . it is the duty of the Laity to aid in this combat . . . This is especially the duty of parents . . . to see that their children are brought up in the fear and love of God . . . " He then outlines the content of the Petition. This petition states the truth, and what Catholics are entitled to, in justice for taxes paid. Such



rights cannot be set aside, the Bishop assures them.

He then considers the objection that religion in education is "sectarian education . . . a mere cry to catch the unwary and the indolent of all sects. We cannot admit that the term 'sectarian' is applicable to the Catholic Church, for the Catholic Church is not a sect, a cut off branch such as the word implies." It is the tree from which some branches have been lopped. He recalls the strong financial support for Catholic schools, which are "not inferior" to other schools.

He prays God's blessing on them, and quotes Matt 16. 26, "For what does it profit a man to gain the whole world . . . " and Matt 6. 33, "Seek ye first the Kingdom of God . . . "

#### **Pastoral for Lent 1874.**

His next Pastoral for Lent 1874 <sup>124</sup> reflected on Church councils - general, provincial and local synods, and moved to favourite topics of education and the struggle for a just share of the education vote, mixed marriages, support of the clergy, propagation of the faith and monetary support of the dispossessed Pope.

Dearly Beloved Brethren. - In accordance with an ancient custom, which has been sanctioned by sacred canons, the Holy Catholic Church has, on numerous occasions, assembled her councils, some general and some particular, but all having the same object in view, vis., the glory of God and the salvation of souls.

He goes on to point out of these councils "how eminently conducive they have been" to the progress and advancement of religion, "on which true progress depends." The Church is the same that it always has ever been - the pillar and ground of truth ; 1 Tim 3. 15, for Christ promised to remain with it all days, even to the consummation of the world (Matt.27. 20), and to send the Spirit of Truth to abide with it forever (John 14. 16), and its pastors now, as before, enjoy natural and supernatural aids, so as to enable them to conduct in safety the barque of Peter through these storms with which it has been constantly assailed.

What general councils are to the universal, and what particular councils are to the nation or province , diocesan synods are to the diocese, inasmuch as they are occupied with "the propagation of the Catholic Faith, the extirpation of error, the correction of morals, and the diffusion of religion and piety." He then quotes Benedict XVI to point out that such synods are demanded by Canon Law and the Council of Trent. "The new and flourishing Church of Australia has already had its councils. Its first Provincial Council is dated September 1844. It was convoked by the Metropolitan, Most Rev. Dr Polding, Archbishop of Sydney, who had, as his associates two bishops, the Most Rev. Dr Willson, Bishop of Hobart Town, and the Most Rev. Dr Murphy, Bishop of Adelaide, the representatives of the only two (other) Sees existing at that time in Australia. The second Council was convoked by that same illustrious Archbishop, and was held in Melbourne in April, 1869. It was attended by the Metropolitan as President, and six bishops of the province, who represented an equal number of dioceses, there being also two other dioceses that were vacant at the time, and had no representative at the Council . . . . " \*

\*The Bishop was wrong here with his figures, as the Pastoral of the Provincial Council referred to was signed by eight Bishops, and there were in addition, two vacant sees. <sup>125</sup>

---

<sup>124</sup> CA 6/MUR 21 A&B -2 copies.

<sup>125</sup> See CA 6/MUR 30, Pastoral of Provincial Council, 1869.

The Bishop points out that the Synod was attended by all the clergy save two who were legitimately absent. "The Catholic laity also of Hobart Town, attended the public sessions and evening services in large numbers.

The subject of the first decree is that of education. The synod unanimously resolved :

1. That a Catholic Association, consisting of the priests of the diocese, and influential laics (lay people) be established for the promotion of Catholic education in the diocese.
2. That in order to further this object, a collection be made annually throughout the diocese on the first and second Sundays in May, having especially in view the introduction of Christian Brothers, or other religious teachers into this diocese.
3. That every priest in the diocese use his best influence with the members of Parliament for the purpose of obtaining a due share of the educational grant from the public treasury towards denominational education.

The second decree of the Provincial Council regards the sanctity of the sacrament of marriage, and contains instructions on how and where marriages between Catholics and non-Catholics may be contracted, and on this very important matter, the Synod decided: -

1. That in the administration of mixed marriages an exhortation may be made to the contracting parties.
2. They may be celebrated in the sacristy of the church or in a private house.
3. That the consent of both parties is to be taken according to the usual form, . . .
4. The husband may be directed when to place the ring on the finger of the wife.
5. That no priest celebrate a mixed marriage without obtaining a promise from the Catholic and the non-Catholic party that " the children will be Catholic, that the Catholic will be allowed the full exercise of religion", and that the Catholic promises that he/she will attempt the conversion of the non-Catholic partner.

The third decree dealt with the need to support the clergy with money, to enable them to continue to serve their people.

The fourth decree, concerned the establishment of the Society for the Propagation of the Faith. He outlines the work of the Society to "Pagan nations" and reminds the people that this diocese has been a beneficiary of the Society. He repeats his strong recommendation that it be adopted in the diocese, which he had first made in his 1867 Pastoral, his first to the diocese after his arrival in the colony.

These decisions, implementing those of the Provincial Council, and forced through it by the majority of Irish bishops there, mark Bishop Murphy's strong push to establish Catholic schools, and to show Church disapproval of mixed marriages. This latter changed the current position on such marriages adopted by Willson and Polding. Both measures were to contribute to the rising tide of sectarianism in the colony.

### **Lenten Pastoral for 1877.**

A large gap exists in the record and the next Lenten Pastoral is issued for 1877. <sup>126</sup> This one concerns the problem of the first St Mary's Cathedral which now needed to be demolished as unsafe. It was closed and the Bishop returned his Chair to St Joseph's. This was a matter of great moment to the diocese and even to the wider community. The Governor chaired meetings on the subject and headed the subscription list - another indication that sectarian ill-feeling was not yet at the peak it was to reach.

---

<sup>126</sup> *The Tasmanian Catholic Standard*, February, 1877, p 56.

He begins by quoting Gen 28. 17: "This is no other than the House of God and the Gate of Heaven." He refers to "the Patriarch Jacob" using these words, and applies them to "the Christian Church" and the erection of new churches. He refers to the churches rising in "the Australias" rivalling those of the old world. Christ reminded us that his Father's house "is a house of Prayer." Matt 21. 13, and adds 2 Chron 7. 16, "For it is the place that He has chosen and sanctified that His name may be there for ever, and His eyes and His heart remain there perpetually." He then refers to the Real Presence of Christ in the tabernacle, and the Mass that makes him present. Here God is made known to the people, baptism administered, the Table feeds us, and sins are forgiven. He emphasises the above by quoting Ps 84. 1, 2, 3, 5: "How lovely are Thy tabernacles, O Lord of Hosts, . . ."

"All this . . . applies in a higher degree to the Cathedral Church," because additional sacred functions are carried out there - priests ordained, Oils consecrated, and the Bishop presides. Dr Murphy mentions Bishop Willson's commencement, the donation of Roderick O'Connor's £10,000, the collection of £3,000, and the skills of the architect. But God permitted disappointment in the structural weakness of the first Cathedral, and it was closed. "Two architects of ability and experience, Major Goodfellow of the Royal Engineers, and Henry Hunter, Esq., . . . pronounced it to be in a dangerous condition, . . . the only wise course . . . to take down the main part of the Church, especially the tower, and to rebuild and finish it on an altered plan and new foundations."

This was submitted to a public meeting at the Cathedral in February, 1876, presided over by "His Excellency the Governor", and unanimously adopted. A resolution to appeal for funds was also unanimous, and a committee was set up "to assist in the work." £1,100 was promised at the meeting. Tenders were called and three received. These were rejected by architects and Bishop, and fresh ones called. "That of Messrs. Shield, which amounted to £6,000, less £5, although not the lowest, was accepted, because of the deservedly high estimation which they have gained for themselves in Hobart. The work of pulling down was commenced last September, . . ." revealing further how unsafe the building was. He then includes letters from Henry Hunter, Architect; from Bishop Willson in 1864, asking Mr Hunter if he is satisfied with the building, and should the builder be asked to remedy any defects that the architect may know of; the reply of Mr Hunter to the above, outlining the faults, and blaming the builder's foreman, not the absentee builder!

The Bishop asks the people to thank God that the old Cathedral did not collapse with great loss of life. Fund raising has commenced, and Rev Michael Beechinor has been sent to Brisbane to appeal for funds, with that Bishop's approval. He reminds Hobartians that they need to contribute as "the Cathedral is in your midst." This is a work of great merit, and he quotes James 2. 26, "As the body without the spirit is dead, so also faith without good work is dead." The Lord will reward all who help, Matt 10. 42, which is about the Lord valuing the cup of water given in His name. He quotes 1 Chron 29, 6-10, the response of the people to David's call for funds to build the Temple, and David's thanksgiving for the result. "Be you, dearly beloved brethren, animated by a spirit of zeal and liberality, like to that of the Israelites. . . ." and he urges generosity.

This was not a matter without argument. Soon the Bishop is to withdraw his approval of The Tasmanian Catholic Standard, edited by Mr Joseph Roper, and published by Mr Henry Shirley. This paper had succeeded the two earlier Catholic journals, and the Bishop authorised the new venture in 1876. At a public meeting Mr Roper had allegedly spoken against the Bishop's Cathedral plans. Soon he was accused of not publishing a leader in support of the project, episcopal approval of his journal was withdrawn, and the Bishop authorised another under the same name, edited by his nephew, Michael Beechinor. The

Roper-Shirley venture continued as *The Catholic Standard*. In the ensuing "Battle of the Standards", the Beechinor paper was trounced, despite the episcopal approbation. People and clergy preferred the unauthorised journal as Beechinor "had no qualifications for the position." During the dispute, the threat of excommunication was used in the Huon area. This matter is fully treated in the section on the Bishop's rule of the diocese.

#### **Pastoral on the Indian Relief Fund, 1877.** <sup>127</sup>

This was occasioned by the famine in Madras, and the Bishop recalls the Governor's chairing a meeting in the Hobart Town Hall to appeal for funds "to assist in allaying this terrible visitation."

Dr Murphy, well into the fund-raising appeal to rebuild the Cathedral, is still aware of calls on the charity of his Church that are acute enough to displace local concerns for a short time. There would be no doubting his genuine concern for the area of India where he had laboured for 25 years, his love of the people there, and it is testimony to his breadth of humanity, transcending both race and religion.

#### **Pastoral for Lent, 1878.** <sup>128</sup>

The Bishop begins by quoting 1 Pet 5. 8, "Be sober and watch: . . . the devil, as a roaring lion . . . seeking whom he may devour." He continues "The life of man upon earth," says John 8. 1, 'is a warfare. His enemy is the devil whose aim is the spiritual ruin of man.'" (This is not Jn 8. 1, and the text as quoted has not been able to be located.) He points out that the devil "employs a thousand ways to accomplish his end", including our need for food and drink to sustain life. "Hence the necessity for sobriety and vigilance to the practice of which the Apostle exhorts us, 'Be sober and watch.'" He goes on to point out that one who fasts but still "exceeds in the use of intoxicating drinks cannot be said to fulfil the precept of fasting, or to duly commemorate the sufferings of our Divine Lord."

Intemperance grievously offends God . . . his wonderful creation is for man's "use and benefit. . . Those gifts must be used in a rational manner, . . . in accordance with the advice of St. Paul, 'Whether you eat or drink or what ever else you do, do all to the glory of God, 1 Cor. 10. 31'; but the intemperate man abuses those gifts, dishonours God, and grievously offends him, and the same sacred writer hesitates not to class intemperance with other vices which exclude from the kingdom of God."

He goes on to emphasise that intemperance "extinguishes within him the light of reason, that noble faculty which likens him to his Creator, and he reduces himself to a level with the brute creation, . . . " The evils do not stop here, "they extend to the family and society in general. It is a cause of bitter dissension between husband and wife, of disedification to their children, and frequently of ruin to the family. Society suffers in various ways. It renders the man of position and responsibility unfaithful to his trust, and deprives the employer of those gains to which wages regularly paid entitle him. It is the fruitful source of crime and misery and throws upon the State the necessity of providing and supporting additional accommodation for its criminals and its poor, and thus of increasing the public taxes."

The Clergy is urged to check and eradicate this evil, and Luke 15. 7 is quoted to underlie this plea. He then talks of the addict failing to admit his problem and the excuses that he makes for his habit. The Bishop suggests a remedy and quotes Ez 33. 2, the remedy being prayer and the sacraments "by which the divine grace which is necessary for overcoming

<sup>127</sup> *The Tasmanian Catholic Standard*, November, 1877, p 203.

<sup>128</sup> CA 6/MUR 22.

vices of every kind can be obtained." He quotes Jn 16. 24-25 in support of prayer and makes an eloquent plea on behalf of reception of the sacraments. He then urges "all the faithful of our Diocese" in the words of Joel 2. 12-13, "... be connected with me with all your heart, in fasting, and in weeping, and in mourning. And rend your hearts, not your garments, and turn to the Lord your God: for he is gracious and merciful, patient and rich in mercy." And he adds a quote: "Behold, now is the acceptable time, behold, now is the day of salvation. St Paul, 4. 2, (sic)" (2 Cor 6. 2). Dr Murphy was not inclined to regard drink as an evil in itself, but condemned the misuse of it. Here he was much less Jansenistic than Dr Willson had been. The first Bishop frequently wrote and taught against drink and dancing, and was a sterner exponent of correct Sabbath observance.

He moves to the appeal made two years ago for "our Cathedral building fund, and, we have the consolation to inform you that that appeal has been generously responded to wherever it was made. The amount of subscriptions actually received during the period has reached the sum of £4100, of which £1720 has been collected by the Rev D.F.X. Beechinor in the dioceses of Brisbane and Armidale. God has manifestly blessed the work because it is His, and to Him and to His blessed Mother whose name it bears, we should unite in rendering grateful thanks, whilst acknowledging our obligations to our benefactors at home and abroad - Catholics and non-Catholics - we pray God to bless them a hundredfold." He reports that "the building is being carried on without interruption and in a satisfactory manner. The sum expended on it up to date is £1743, leaving a balance of £2357 available to prosecute the works." Next his plea to "continue our best efforts to collect the remainder of the sum necessary to complete the building." Collectors are exhorted to continue, and "we appeal to those who have not as yet contributed, to aid us in this noble work."

He then moves to Roman events, close to his own heart, and those of his hearers: "Finally, we have to ask your prayers for the repose of the soul of our late Holy Father, Pius the Ninth, who departed this life on 6th February, at the Vatican." After outlining the claims to greatness of the deceased Pope, he announces the election of his successor. "Whilst employed in writing the foregoing lines, the truly joyful intelligence of the election of a successor to Pope Pius the Ninth, in the person of Cardinal Pecci, who has taken the name of Leo the Thirteenth, has reached us."

Bishop Murphy is consistently a supporter of a strong Papacy. Such an institution is essential to his view of the Church, and he would have no truck with Gallican ideas. The acid test is the one of money - he orders the re-introduction of the collection for the Pope, even when struggling to fund his Cathedral and his schools.

#### **Pastoral for Lent, 1879.** <sup>129</sup>

The Bishop begins by quoting Col 2. 8-7 (sic). He points out that St Paul "warns his hearers against the philosophy of the time." This warning is applicable today "for the so-called modern philosophy is impregnated with Pagan errors," and leads many astray as it "denies the existence of a personal God, confounding his nature with that of the world, ... for it affirms that the world is in itself sufficient for all the purposes for which it exists, ... It teaches that indifference in matters of faith is lawful, and whilst a person leads a correct and moral life it matters not to what religion he may belong. ... reason is the sole judge of truth and what is incomprehensible to the intellect must be rejected, in which category are included the mysteries of revelation, and by consequence the mysteries of nature also."

Such doctrines are everywhere disseminated, and he goes on to quote the last Easter

---

<sup>129</sup> CA 6/mur 23.

Encyclical of Leo XIII on the same subject. "and since the enemies of public order know this thoroughly well, they have thought that nothing could better suit their purpose of plucking up the foundations of society than that they should aim continual assaults at the Church of God, and that they should weaken by new wounds day by day her authority and influence." Murphy points out that the Church is "'the pillar and ground of truth', 1 Tim 3.15, and the teacher of all nations." Christ promised to be with the Church "to the consummation of the world," Mat 28. 19-20 "and to send them the spirit of truth to abide with them for ever, and to teach them all truth. Jn 14. 2." With this divine teaching mission, the Church has "through her Supreme Pontiffs or General Councils" guarded the purity of the deposit of faith. He then notes the teaching of Vatican 1 and summarises "She declares that there is one true and living God, . . . He must be really and substantially distinct from this world, . . . that God . . . can be known by the light of reason from created things. He next quotes direct from Vatican 1. ". . . She teaches the existence of revelation . . . there cannot be any repugnance between reason and revelation, for it is the same God who reveals mysteries and infuses faith, and has set the light of reason in the human mind. . . . (the Church) neither ignores nor despises the benefits that flow from science into the life of man, she rather affirms that as much as science proceeds from the God who is the God of the sciences, so if rightly handled by the help of His grace they lead to God again."

He then summarises the propositions anathematised by Vatican 1: those who deny the existence of one true God; those who affirm there is nothing else but matter, or that the substance and essence of God is the same as that of all things; those who deny divine revelation; those who claim reason alone is sufficient; those who deny the inspiration of Scripture; and some anathematised by the Syllabus of Errors: the denial of the action of God upon man and the world; that reason is the sole judge of truth; that man is free to embrace and profess any religion; that man can be saved in any religion whatsoever. He urges all to adhere to the words of the Pope, here quoted, to avoid these errors: "to adhere more closely and strictly to the Holy See, the chair of truth and justice, and receive all its teaching with cordial assent of mind and will, and utterly reject opinions, even the most widely spread, which are opposed to the doctrines of the Church."

Dr Murphy has here shown his grasp of the theology of God and how He relates to His creation. This familiarity with theology and the ability to make it understandable to his hearers is one of his gifts. He can also apply these theological principles, backed up with a knowledge of Scripture, which he usually uses so accurately, to draw conclusions for the circumstances of his time. Added to his theological and Scriptural expertise is the fact that he was an acknowledged scientist. His speciality was astronomy, and he maintained his own observatory in his home. (His telescope is now in the Archives of the Presentation Sisters at Blackmans Bay). He was a Fellow of the Royal Society of Tasmania,<sup>130</sup> and delivered papers at two Inter-colonial Science Congresses.<sup>131</sup>

Murphy himself then continues: "One of the most powerful means used by the advocates of modern philosophy for the propagation of its errors are the Public Schools and Colleges. Let us, they say, commence with the youth of each country, banish religion of every kind from their early training, and after the lapse of a few generations we shall see our expectations realised by the triumph of disbelief over faith. The Pastors of the Church fully aware of these tactics, have everywhere exercised their vigilance and care in warning parents against them, and exhorting them to provide schools where the young may be brought up in the fear and love of God, as well as instructed in secular knowledge, and

<sup>130</sup> 1892 'Report of the Royal Society of Tasmania' published in *Papers and Proceedings of the Royal Society of Tasmania*, 1891-93.

<sup>131</sup> ADB, p 316.

everywhere the call has been nobly, and with great sacrifice, responded to by the faithful. England, Ireland, France, America, and other countries of the West afford splendid testimony of this." He outlines the work of Australian Catholics here and quotes the Second Provincial Synod of 1869, and its decrees on education. He refers to the Diocesan Synod of 1873 and quotes their decrees too. He reports that the "Catholic Association" called for by this Synod has been set up, and regular collections made "so that by their aid such arrangements have been made as to enable the Christian Brothers to open a school for boys in Hobart Town in the course of a few months." He outlines the education of girls in Hobart Town, Launceston and "several country districts" have schools under "the admirable tuition of the Sisters of the Presentation Order, and the Sisters of Charity," or other teachers. "Yet a great deal more is to be done in this respect throughout the Diocese, and we earnestly entreat you, dearly beloved brethren, to go on and persevere in a work of vital importance to the eternal interests of your children, and one full of merit." There follows a warning about the dangers of Public Schools, the danger of which is not so much "perversion to the errors of Protestantism," but "indifference to all religions." A local problem is dealt with: "nor is it to be inferred that because some of our clergy hold connection with them (ie Public Schools) that the faithful are relieved from the responsibility of providing Catholic Schools for their children, for this protection is simply and solely of a protective nature, and has nothing to do with internal management. . . . we confess it to be a weak barrier against the pernicious influence of education robbed of its essential element - religion."

He then quotes direct and at length, from Leo XIII to his Cardinal Vicar, concerning the banishing of the catechism from the Public Schools of Rome. He then resumes and states that "our Sunday Schools" are insufficient "to meet the religious requirements of our youth." He quotes Cardinal Manning, "who is literally doing wonders in providing Catholic schools for the youth of his diocese: 'As to the instruction of our children on Sunday afternoons, those who have the experience of the parish priest know it to be a simple absurdity.'"

Next comes the example of "the ever faithful Catholics of Ireland" who "afford us a noble example in this respect" and who have achieved justice with the Intermediate Education Act, so that the rights of conscience are respected there.

The work on St Mary's Cathedral proceeds uninterrupted, "and are now so advanced as to present an imposing appearance. The meeting had determined on "an important addition to . . . the west end of the church. . . . would provide a gallery for a choir. . . . It is estimated to cost £1000. . . the meeting pledged itself that they would assist in procuring the funds necessary for its completion as well as for the works now in hand, which will cost about £2000 extra, leaving altogether £3000 to be collected. We may add that the front of the church and the tower of which the foundations are laid are not included in the above." He commends the cause to the people.

Then he calls the attention of the faithful to Lent and its meaning, quoting Job 12. 8-9; (correctly, Joel 2. 12-13) Job 12. 8-9 (correctly, Tob 12. 8-9); Phil 4. 6-7; Jn 16. 23-4.

### **Section of Lenten Pastoral, 1880.** <sup>132</sup>

The Catholic Standard, March, 1880, p 40, reprints some paragraphs of Bishop Murphy's Lenten Pastoral, 1880. This is the proscribed 'opposition' Standard, and in the previous month, had printed the rules for Lent from the previous year, noting that the Pastoral was not yet available to them and that they hoped to publish it next month. It did not appear

<sup>132</sup> *The Catholic Standard*, March, 1880.

then.

The Bishop begins with an appeal for funds for the famine in Ireland, asking his people to support the civic appeal opened by the Mayor of Hobart Town: "We avail ourselves, dearly beloved brethren, of the favourable opportunity of asking you to unite your efforts with those that are being made by the citizens of Hobart Town, to raise a fund to be devoted to the relief of the fearful distress which now prevails in Ireland, especially in the southern and western provinces. As to the existence of this distress there can be no doubt; it is unhappily too well attested by the public press and telegraphic messages to the Mayors of Hobart Town and Adelaide, and at this moment vast numbers of our fellow country-men are exposed to all the privations arising from want of food, want of fuel, and want of clothing."

The paper then summarises the section of the Pastoral on perjury: -" . . . His lordship the Bishop calls special attention to the frequency with which blasphemy and perjury are committed, 'than which more heinous sins can hardly be conceived.' 'Truth and justice,' continues the Bishop,

are, dearly beloved brethren, qualities which according to natural as well as divine law should characterise the conduct of man at all times in his relation with both God and his fellow man. They should be his rule of life, and he who follows them is universally esteemed and respected, while he who feels no hesitation in disregarding them is condemned and distrusted. What object more loathed by society than the liar, and what more deserving of indignation than the unjust man. Now if truth and justice are indispensable requisites in the everyday transactions of life, how much more necessary are they not when the most sacred name of God is introduced to attest their presence, or in other words when an oath is taken; for God is truth itself, justice itself. These are attributes which belong to his nature. He is essentially true, essentially just, and cannot be otherwise without forfeiting his claims to a being of infinite perfections and worthy of faith and confidence. Now he who swears falsely or unjustly has the hardihood to invoke the name of God to attest a falsehood or to invoke an injustice, and by thus violating his most sacred rights he commits an offence of a most heinous character. Such a one is a perjurer and a blasphemer. Moreover, in addition to the outrage committed against the Divine majesty, he is also guilty of a grievous wrong to his neighbour by robbing him of the right which belongs to him, of having the truth made known and justice done him, and as far as lies in his power he destroys that good faith and sincerity which form the bond of society. Such, dearly beloved brethren, are the characteristics of perjury and blasphemy, which contain a species of impiety and malice peculiar to themselves, and which justly merit the vengeance of the Almighty. 'A curse shall come to the house of him who sweareth falsely, and shall remain in the midst of his house, and shall consume it' (Zacharias 5. 4). [See Zech 5. 3-4.] 'Let not thy mouth be accustomed to swearing, for in it there are many falls' (Sir 23. 9.) [See Sir 23. 9-10.] 'He that blasphemeth the name of the Lord dying, let him die' Lev 24. 10.) [See Lev 24. 16.]

Communications of this kind should strike terror into the hearts of the most hardened offenders, and should impress all with the necessity of using due caution and discretion (the third condition prescribed by the prophet) when taking a formal oath in a court of justice or elsewhere. They should be prepared to state nothing contrary to truth or justice, no matter how near or dear to them the matters at stake may be. The Church, solicitous for the honour of its Founder, has legislated on this point, and has shown her horror of this crime by the severe ecclesiastical censures



---

she has passed against it. Nor is the State wanting in its duty in this respect, for it has enacted laws for the punishment of convicted perjurers.

These problems must have been notable in the colony for this sort of offensive to be mounted against them.

**Pastoral for Lent, 1881.** <sup>133</sup>

Dr Murphy begins by quoting Eph 5. 30 "This is a great sacrament: but I speak in Christ and in the Church," and is today translated "this mystery has great significance, but I am applying it to Christ and the Church." The Bishop is teaching on marriage - which "has always held . . . a most important position in the world; . . . is the foundation of the family, which in turn becomes the foundation of society. The family is described as a little kingdom, having its ruler, its subjects, and its laws: and the kingdom is described as a great family, or an aggregation of families. If, then, marriage is entered upon with due respect and decorum, and with a sense of the responsibility incurred by it, there is reason to hope that the family will be brought up in submission to divine and human law, and thus form the basis of a well ordered and happy people."

Murphy then traces marriage from the creation of Adam and Eve in the image of God, using the second creation account of Eve, quoting Gen 2, 18, 21-24. "The holy Fathers, commenting on this passage, say that the circumstances connected with the formation of Eve are meant to show that the wife is not to consider herself as the superior or head of the husband, neither is she to be treated as his slave, but as a companion, to whom he owes the utmost affection and fidelity, given him to aid him in the labours and trials of life, and designed to carry out the designs of Providence, to propagate and sanctify the human race."

He continues, pointing out that the "Patriarchs and Prophets" looked upon marriage in this light. He quotes Paul again, the text he opened with. The state is great because it was instituted by Christ, to give grace to the family, and represents "the union . . . between Christ and His Church." The Bishop continues "Jesus Christ," says the Council of Trent, "Who is the author and Consummation of the sacraments, has merited by His passion a grace capable of perfecting the natural love of man and woman, and strengthening the union that exists between them."

He then quotes at length from the 1877 Encyclical of Leo XIII to further establish the dignity of the married state. Murphy then quotes from the same encyclical, from the section dealing with mixed marriages: "Care ought also be taken lest alliances be lightly sought with those who are aliens from the Catholic name. . . . Indeed, it is most evident that marriages of this kind should be avoided, from the fact of their giving occasion to forbidden communication in sacred things."

The Bishop then goes on to warn "that those who desire to engage in the married state . . . should also recollect that the bond of marriage is indissoluble, and cannot be severed unless by the death of one of the parties. . . This is the law of the Catholic Church, . . . which is founded on the express command of our Lord - 'What therefore God has joined together, let no man put asunder.' - Matt 19. 6. 'Whoever shall put away his wife and shall marry another committeth adultery: and he that shall marry her that is put away committeth adultery'. - Matt 19. 9." He quotes also from Paul, 1 Cor 7. 10-11. "In validly contracted marriages, the Church has never allowed and never can allow divorce with permission to enter upon another marriage."

---

<sup>133</sup> CA 6/mur 24.

"In connection with this subject are espousals which are a voluntary and mutual promise of future marriage deliberately made by persons who are lawfully capable of doing so. Such promise or engagement is recognised by both Church and State. It binds under pain of sin, and for its dissolution the consent of both parties is necessary. Engagements of this kind are but too common in this country. . . . lightly made, . . . without a serious intention . . . the occasion of sin to both parties, . . . shame and ruin to the female . . . for . . . a freedom is taken which modesty and decorum would not permit . . . and which lead to disastrous consequences."

Parents are urged to ensure that (1) their children enter into engagements "with mature deliberation, and with persons of known probity and virtue; and (2) to exercise a judicious vigilance over them, so that nothing is done which would imperil the sanctity of their future state." The Bishop continues, urging " . . . young persons themselves to be select in the choice . . . look for virtuous companions . . . to consult their parents and pastor" in these matters.

Then obligations of the married state apply also to the children of the marriage - "it becomes an indispensable duty on the part of the parents to bring up their children in the fear and love of God, . . . the salvation of their (the parents') souls depends upon it" and quotes Paul; "if any man have not care of his own, and especially of those of his house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel." 1 Tim 5. 8. Here again, Bishop Murphy uncharacteristically applies this same verse to teaching the faith, when the writer is urging support for the members of the household.

Warnings follow about the many dangers to the faith of children "from bad example, and the spirit of the age, which is that of indifferentism and infidelity. These have their root and nourishment in the system of education carried on in the public schools. He reminds them that he has frequently "given you the opinions of distinguished writers, Catholic and non-Catholic, on this subject" Dr Murphy now quotes "Mr Grant White, an American writer of high repute. He says that the results of the system as it exists in America 'is deterioration in the purity of morals, in decency of life, in thrift, in all that goes to make good citizens, accompanied by a steady failure of the very elements of useful knowledge,' and 'that crime and vice have increased year after year pari passu with the development of the public school system.' - North American Review, December 1880."

He then recounts the establishment of Catholic schools in the United States, and mentions Belgium, and the colonies of Victoria, NSW, SA and Queensland. Tasmania has started, but much remains to be done. Catholics are exhorted to continue to fund the establishment of Catholic schools. He closes with mention of the Cathedral opening on the 20th of January, "which has given joy to all who witnessed it, and to the Catholics generally, we doubt not, of the diocese." He ends with a plea to continue to defray the debt remaining. "About £2,500 are still due, and we trust that you, dearly beloved brethren, will not relax your efforts till this is liquidated."

#### **Pastoral for Lent, 1882.<sup>134</sup>**

Dr Murphy's opening quote is from Gen 3. 19, "Remember that thou art dust, and into dust thou shalt return."

The Bishop begins with the Ash Wednesday ceremony of the ashes, and reminds people that the priest uses these words from Genesis. "They are so used . . . to remind us of the

---

<sup>134</sup> CA 6/mur 25.

---

certainty of death, and to teach us the virtue of humility."

He explains the purpose of fasting. He quotes Joel 2. 12-13, and relates the story of Jonas, Ch 3, outlining the effectiveness of the fast and repentance. He then mentions Christ's fasting and the words of Mark, 9. 28, "This kind (of devil) came only out by prayer and fasting." Next, lives of the saints are used to add value to fasting. He then moves to "Alms-giving is a work which should engage our attention on all occasions of poverty and distress, and especially so during Lent. It consists of relieving the indigent by supplying their wants with money offerings or with food and clothing."

Such work is "recommended by natural sympathies," and "is strictly enjoined by our divine Lord." The Bishop then quotes Luke 25, meaning Matt 25. 33-46 on the last judgment. Concerning prayer, he quotes "whatever we shall ask him in the name of his divine Son, shall be granted to us," unattributed, perhaps from Jn 16. 24. (This is not typical of Bishop Murphy). He follows it with "Ask and you shall receive . . ." again without attribution but from Luke 11. 9, or Matt 7. 7. He then quotes Sir 35. 21 from the Vulgate numbering "The prayer of him that humbles himself shall pierce the clouds, and not depart till the Most High beholds." He appeals to the writings of the saints to uphold this.

He then urges " . . . the frequentation of the sacraments . . . which are the mainstay of the spiritual life, . . . which are as necessary . . . as corporal food is . . ." Penance forgives all sin "provided you confess them honestly and repent them seriously." He then argues the necessity of auricular confession, and quotes James 5. 16 who "exhorted the priests of his day to confess their sins to one another," and 1 Jn 1. 9, "If we confess our sins, (God) is faithful and just to forgive our sins and to cleanse us from all iniquity." Murphy continues, "It was in obedience to this teaching that 'many of them believed,' (as we read in Acts 19. 18) and came to the Apostles 'confessing and declaring their deeds.' He closes the paragraph with a rousing affirmation of the sacrament of Penance, and its use "for the sanctification of mankind."

"The Holy Eucharist is the last will and testament made by our Lord shortly before his death . . ." He quotes the institution of the Eucharist from Matt 26. 26-8, and quotes Jn 6. (54) on the effects of that sacrament "He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath life everlasting . . ." He backs this up with 2 Cor 6. 1-2 "In an accepted time I have heard thee, and in the day of salvation I have helped thee; behold, now is the accepted time - behold, now is the day of salvation."

He then tells them of his coming trip to Rome to see the Pope and "to lay before him a report of the state of religion in this Diocese of Hobart. . . ."

He then announces the appointments of Very Rev Archdeacon Hohan, and Very Rev Dean Woods "joint Administrators of the diocese during our absence." He requests the prayers of the people, and bids them goodbye.

### **Pastoral for Lent 1883.<sup>135</sup>**

The opening quote is Matt 5. 7 "Blessed are the merciful, for they shall obtain mercy."

The Bishop begins "One of the good deeds recommended to our practice during Lent is alms-deeds. These are the outcome of that compassion for our suffering brethren, which the Almighty has implanted in the heart of man for an object worthy of his infinite wisdom."

---

<sup>135</sup> CA 6/mur 26.

He quotes a divine command Deut 15. 2 (4), "There will not be wanting poor in the land of thy habitation: therefore I command thee to open thy hand to thy needy and poor brother that liveth in the land." Is 58. 7 "deal thy bread to the hungry. . . ." He then says that the intention of God is "that the wealthy should share a portion of their wealth with the poor," in a divine mutuality, wherein "the poor would by their prayers obtain many favours for the rich in return for the(ir) assistance, . . ." He quotes Matthew 25. 41-43 to clinch the argument. "Depart from me, ye cursed, . . . For I was hungry and you gave me not to eat, . . ."

Dr Murphy begins "The Fathers of the Church, . . . re-echo the language of their Divine Master. . . St Gregory Nazienzen exhorts his hearers to succour the miserable and to become like God. . . St Jerome says 'I do not remember to have read that anyone suffered an unhappy end who willingly performed works of charity'. . . St Chrysostom adds that 'No one can save you from the fire of hell unless you have the aid of the poor.'

Some may think they are not rich enough to be covered by this law. "This is a pernicious fallacy, for instructed by St John 1. 3, 'He that hath the substance of this world,' though not in a large measure, is bound to use a portion of it for charitable purposes according to his ability; so that it may be said that there are few among that class of persons whose means are so limited as to forbid them giving something, which something, like the widow's mite recorded in the Gospel, will have its reward." He points out that our alms-deeds "are not to be restricted to our own kindred, race, or creed, although it is admitted that they should have preference, for charity begins at home, though it should not end there." He mentions the Good Samaritan to show the universality of the law of charity, and extends it to social institutions, "such as orphan asylums and other benevolent institutions, established for the relief of human misery."

Murphy continues that alms-giving is "universally acknowledged" as praiseworthy, but to gain its promised rewards, "it should be made, not only with the intention of relieving the distressed, but also of pleasing God." He quotes Matt 6. 1-3, " . . . that you do not your justice before men, to be seen by them; otherwise you shall not have a reward . . ."

He now moves to a report of his Roman trip, and the delightful reception of himself by the new Pope: "It now remains to us, Dearly Beloved Brethren, to give you some account of our audience of the Holy Father . . . His Holiness was then pleased to receive us with extreme kindness and paternal affection, . . which we owe to the merits of our clergy and faithful, . . . rather to any merits of our own."

He then informs his hearers: "We subjoin for your information a translation of the letter with which his Eminence Cardinal Simeoni, Prefect of the Propaganda, has favoured us on the above-mentioned subject.

This letter is appended in full in the Pastoral, and after the usual laudatory remarks about the state and progress of the Church in the diocese, it outlines the improvements and directions that Rome would like to see implemented in the future.

It must not, however, be supposed that nothing remains to be added to what has already been done, seeing that some religious Institute for the education of boys ought to be provided, - a matter that I know is now engaging your attention: and besides, more new schools should be set on foot, for fear such Catholics as permit their children to frequent the schools of Protestants, may allege in excuse that they do so through a deficiency of Catholic schools. Finally, the way should be prepared for the founding of a Seminary for Clerics; for by this means a native clergy would

be formed, and the necessity would not exist of having to procure Priests from distant countries, - who are not at all times to be found, nor always possessed of those qualities required in Missionaries.

But this, as you are aware, will have to be provided for by degrees, so that nothing may be left to be desired in the Diocese entrusted to your care, that may tend to its progress and perfection. I have every confidence that this will be rendered the more easy to you, as you have a Clergy closely bound to you in affection and veneration, to whose piety and labours you have borne such excellent testimony. <sup>136</sup>

Bishop Murphy was to take these ideas seriously, and he continued to try to get the Christian Brothers to come to the diocese, and endowed the seminary in his will. <sup>137</sup> In 1885 he purchased an old building at Port Arthur, which he named the Seminary of Ss Peter and Paul. It was destroyed in a fire in 1886. <sup>138</sup>

**Pastoral for Lent, 1884, from Daniel, Bishop of Hobart. <sup>139</sup>**

Bishop Murphy begins with Sir 7. 25, "Hast thou children; instruct them and bow their necks from their childhood," and Eph 6. 4, "And you, fathers, provoke not your children to anger, but bring them up in the discipline and correction of the Lord. He then continues: "Dearly Beloved Brethren, in the law delivered to Moses . . . which was promulgated for the observance of all mankind, no reference is made to the obligations which parents owe their children; nor did our Divine Saviour deem it necessary to issue a new precept on this subject . . . The omission is explained by theologians, . . . superfluous to enact a law for such a purpose, as the natural love parents have for their children is in itself sufficient to dictate what is necessary and useful to promote their spiritual and temporal interests."

He re-quotes the beginning of Sir 7. 25, ending it with "instruct them." He points out that these words include both religious and secular instruction, for both "will enable them to appreciate the power, the wisdom, and the goodness of God, . . ." The first and most essential duty of parents is to teach, or have taught, their children the fear and love of God, a horror of sin, respect for parents, "a love of truth, of meekness, the Catechism, . . ."

He quotes Job 1. 1, 2, 5. "This holy patriarch regarded as his own, the sins of his sons . . .", and then "The Mother of the Maccabees affords another instance of the good results of instruction." He then moves further into his theme: "To instruction it is necessary to join correction." He re-quotes Sir 7. 25, adding to ". . . bow down their necks from childhood," the verse "Bring them up in the discipline and correction of the Lord." ( Eph. 6. 4.) The Bishop continues "Even in childhood the germs of those faults to which human nature is subject, are discovered." He then quotes successive texts, Prov 22. 15; 29. 15; Sir 30. 8,9,11; 'The rod of correction', 'the rod and reproof', 'and give him not liberty when a youth' sum up these texts. He endorses these inspired words, urges moderation in the use of the rod, and ends with the warning that parents who fail to control their children "are held responsible by God for the vices of their children in after life."

"Example is another element which should enter into the plan for the education of children." He states the power of example, its great effect on children, because of their skills of observation and ability to imitate, "especially those to whom they owe respect and

<sup>136</sup> CA 6/mur 8, the Latin original of this letter.

<sup>137</sup> CA 6/mur 23 - Probate document on Dr Murphy's will.

<sup>138</sup> Cullen 'Shell Minute Book', p 66ff.

<sup>139</sup> CA 6/mur 27.

affection." He then reminds parents "how careful" they should be "in language and conduct in their presence." Murphy continues "Thus far, dearly beloved brethren, our observations have been devoted to mainly religious and moral training, but there is also the secular or literary instructions, which, in these days of progress and legislative enactment, cannot be neglected." He then points out the bind that parents are in "who have not, as yet, Catholic schools established in their neighbourhood . . ." He warns that public or Protestant schools "expose their faith and morals to the danger of being weakened and lost," and reminds them that he has repeatedly stated this. Again he reminds them that indifferentism leads to infidelity. He warns of the "exposure made by the Press of Victoria to the frightful state of immorality practised by the young pupils of the public schools of that colony, and which raised a cry of indignation throughout the Australias. It may be said that such a state of things does not exist in Tasmania. Whether this is true or not, one thing is certain, that indifference to religion and its practice, and a disregard of the laws of the Church, as to the observance of Sundays and approaching the Sacraments, is too common among our young men."

Only the establishment of Catholic schools can overcome this problem, "and to this most necessary work parents, priests, and bishops are solemnly bound. . . ." He mentions the world-wide spread of Catholic schools to remedy like situations. He refers to the existing Catholic schools, and appeals for further sacrifices, little as compared with those "made by your forefathers at a time when your religion and schools were proscribed under legal penalties of confiscation of property, and of death." He points out that all that is needed now is the regular payment of school fees, "which it is in the power of the generality of (o)ur people to do without much inconvenience to themselves. Yet this sacrifice we believe to be only temporary, for we assure ourselves that our legislators will, in time, acknowledge the justice of your claims to a share of the Education Grant, for the support of your schools, which claims it is in your interest to urge again and again until they are granted."

He closes, urging them to "faithful, compliance with the laws of the Church as to fasting, prayer, alms-deeds and the frequentation of the Sacraments. . . during the holy season of Lent."

#### **Bishop of Hobart's Lenten Pastoral, 1885.<sup>140</sup>**

Dr Murphy begins by quoting "The heavens show forth the glory of God, and the Firmament declareth the work of his hands." - Ps 18. 1." (Now often numbered as Ps 19.)

He opens with the thought that the universe must lead us to God as we consider it. He reminds his hearers that the earth is but a speck in this universe - Bishop Murphy was an astronomer of note. He quotes Job, "Ask the beasts . . . and they shall tell thee . . . the hand of the Lord hath made all these things." (12. 8-10.) He moves to St Paul, "the invisible things of Him, from the creation of the world, are clearly seen . . ." (Rom 1. 20). "How beautiful and significant are not the words of David . . . 'Praise Him all ye stars and light. Praise Him ye heavens of heaven.' "For He spoke and they were made; He commanded, and they were created.' Ps 148. 3-5."

He then tells us that the light of reason has done much to reveal God, but the light of revelation, a gift of God, has given us true knowledge of Him. "For He is made known to us not only as our creator and ruler, but as our saviour, sanctifier, and provider to whom we owe the homage of our intellect, and the affections of our will." He continues that the Father has established the Kingdom of His Son, to which all owe obedience, led by the

---

<sup>140</sup> *The Catholic Standard*, March, 1885, p 232.

Pope, and for over 1800 years "a beacon of light to all those who sit in the darkness of error, and an infallible guide to all who follow it." He rejoices that persecution of late has not diverted this Kingdom. Here again, we see the Bishop's grasp of theology, and his ability to explain theological ideas.

This new age has attempted to subvert the supernatural order and impose reason alone as guide. Such people reject the doctrines about God, and His Church, and, denouncing marriage, destroy the foundations of society. They deny God a place in education. Such hold that all power comes from the people, not God. "Such are the doctrines with which Pope Leo XIII charges the sect of Freemasons with-holding and propagating in common with Naturalists, . . . " This prepares the way for anarchy and paganism. The Church knows hostile governments through the world. She is the chief object of their hatred. The overthrow of the temporal power of the Papacy is the outcome of this. He then extrapolates that such governments attack Christian education. Thus the Church is forced to establish Church schools.

The Free-masons have been condemned by seven popes before Leo XIII, and he quotes at length from the Encyclical Genus Humanum, 1884, on Free-masonry. ". . . It is our duty to obey him (the Pope). . . Beware of the Freemasons . . . they wish to deceive you . . . Be loyal to Holy Church, . . . ' He urges Catholic education for children, and the use of Lenten discipline to strengthen them in the assault of the enemy.

#### **Creation of Archbishopric, 1888.**

Dr Murphy is now of advancing age - 70 years when he wrote the last pastoral. He had seen Archbishop Polding die in 1877, and was now the senior prelate of the province, having been a bishop for 39 years. In 1888, the 50th year of his priestly ordination, and the 42nd year of his episcopate, he was honoured by Rome when Hobart was raised to the status of a metropolitan see.<sup>141</sup> This was an extremely popular act, and national Church celebrations took place in Hobart, with a gathering of the hierarchy from the colonies, and an address to the new Archbishop by the Governor.<sup>142</sup> On 12 May, 1889, Patrick Cardinal Moran, Archbishop of Sydney, travelled to Hobart to bestow the Pallium on Archbishop Murphy in St Mary's Cathedral.<sup>143</sup>

#### **Pastoral for Lent 1891, by the Archbishop of Hobart.**<sup>144</sup>

This is the first Pastoral preserved in the series, after the elevation of the See to Metropolitan status. He begins with Eph 5. 32-33, "This is a great sacrament, but I speak in Christ and in the Church. Nevertheless, let every one of you in particular love his wife as himself: and let the wife fear her husband," and Luke 16. 18, "Everyone that putteth away his wife and marrieth another, committeth adultery; he that marrieth her that is put away from her husband, committeth adultery."

Archbishop Murphy continues "Marriage is an institution which is regarded with respect by all nations, ancient and modern, and so important are its obligations, that on their fulfilment depend the happiness of the family and the welfare of society." If the family is as it has been designed by God, "then will society reflect its virtues and accomplish the end for which it was established - the Kingdom of God on earth."

<sup>141</sup> CA 6/mur 12. Latin original dated 3 August, 1888.

<sup>142</sup> Cullens 'Shell' Minute Book, p 66 ff, [uncatalogued]

<sup>143</sup> CA 6/MUR 13 letter dated 10 April, 1889, from Cardinal Moran to Archbishop Murphy.

<sup>144</sup> CA 6/MUR 28.

He points out that it was "at the introduction of Christianity that the true character of marriage was promulgated, and its duties defined." The Church is the "guide and instructor" in this area, as she teaches "that Marriage was instituted by God himself in the Garden of Paradise, for when he created the heavens and the earth in all their beauty and variety as a fitting residence for an order of being who was to be His image and likeness, He then created man: male and female He created them, and He blessed them saying, 'Increase and multiply and fill the earth and subdue it, and rule over the fishes of the sea and the fowls of the air, and all living creatures that move upon the earth.' - Gen 1. 27-28."

"With St Paul, the Church regards Marriage as 'a great sacrament in Jesus Christ and in His church.'" Eph 5. 32. It is great because Jesus "is its author and sanctifier, . . . because it represents the union which exists between Him and His spouse, the Church . . . in the end for which it has been instituted - . . . propagating the human race. . . ." Because of the great regard the Church has for this sacrament, "she abhors anything that militates against its dignity and sacred character, and hence her aversion to mixed marriages, . . . and she strikes with excommunication those unworthy Catholics who contract Marriage outside of their own Church to the scandal of all who know them."

He then points out the contrast with "those who have broken away from the centre of unity." The "so-called reformers" abolished the Sacrament of Matrimony, "robbing the contract of all divine influence, and reducing it to the condition of a civil contract, liable to be dissolved by legal enactment which is known as 'divorce,' and which grants each party the liberty to marry with others." He says that divorce was unknown to the Catholic Church "up to the time of the miscalled Reformation," when "Henry VIII of England was the first to introduce it," and he recalls the "strenuous opposition which the Church offered at this time, at the risk of losing one of her richest provinces. But the ungovernable passion of a lewd monarch, aided by a corrupt and subservient court, prevailed over ecclesiastical authority, to the ruin of morality and the destruction of religion. Divorce was first made difficult of attainment, and attended with such great expenses as to render it available only to the rich. But these impediments were gradually diminished, not only in England, but elsewhere, so as to bring it within the reach of the masses; the consequence is that it is being availed of largely, and to such an extent as to excite the alarm of statesmen for the safety of the commonwealth, so sure it is that any divergence from the straight course of the Church in faith or morals is attended with dismal results."

He emphasises the "inviolability of the Marriage tie" short of death, and relies on the authority of Jesus in Matt 19. 3-6, 9, in answer to the Pharisees' question "Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for any cause?" He quotes Mark 10. 11-12, "Whosoever shall put away his wife and marry another, committeth adultery against her; and if the wife shall put away her husband, and (s)he marry another, she committeth adultery"; and he notes that Luke 19. 18 "records the same words." He then quotes Paul to the Corinthians, "to them that are married, not I, but the Lord commandeth that the wife depart not from her husband; and if she depart, she remain unmarried, or be reconciled to her husband. And let not the husband put away his wife. A woman is bound by the law, as long as her husband liveth; but if her husband dies, she is at liberty, let her remarry whom she will; one in the Lord."

Murphy then recalls the Council of Trent anathematising those who denied the Church's teaching on adultery as set out in Scripture. "Such, dearly beloved brethren, is the law of God, which no human power can contravene without violating a divine ordinance, and which none of the faithful can violate without incurring the censures of the Church, and risking the eternal salvation of their souls."



He closes this section of the Pastoral "Let then the sacred institution of Marriage be a subject of frequent meditation, first, with those who desire to embrace that state of life, . . . and secondly, with the married, that they may pray daily and fervently for divine aid . . . And let not the integrity of your faith and morals be tarnished by the impious doctrines of the age."

The Archbishop then includes news of a letter to bishops from Pope Leo on the question of slavery and Africa. He then makes arrangements for the plea for funds for Africa to be met within the archdiocese. He closes with the admission that he is feeling his advancing age and the burden of his labours, and intends to seek the appointment of a coadjutor. He had in mind Fr Daniel Beechinor, and travelled to Rome with Fr Michael Beechinor to secure his nephew's appointment. However, the priests of the archdiocese, not wanting Fr Daniel to succeed his uncle, petitioned Rome and won the day. Patrick Delany would be consecrated coadjutor with the right of succession on 10 December, 1893.<sup>145</sup>

**Pastoral Letter of the Plenary Council, 1905.**<sup>146</sup>

This is the next Pastoral following that of 1891, and there will not be another from the Archbishop till 1907, the year of his death. As it is possible that Dr Delany is the author of that pastoral, which they both signed, the question arises as to why Dr Murphy, who, to date, has been regular with his duty to issue pastorals, should now fail in that duty for a space of about 14 years. There are none for these years preserved in the set in the Archives, nor have any been recovered from the Catholic papers of the time, although there are not complete collections of these journals. Given the probable authorship of the 1907 Pastoral, if the Archbishop was unable to write, because of advancing age, why did not Dr Delany issue them in the Archbishop's name? Perhaps he was not allowed to, a result of his replacing the Beechinor nomination of the Archbishop? None of Dr Delany's material in the Archives bears on his relationship with the ageing Murphy, and certainly the Archbishop leaves no clue. One thought remains. Dr Delany is usually referred to by others as the Coadjutor Archbishop. In the 1907 Pastoral he signs, after the Archbishop, as "Coadjutor Bishop of Hobart."

This Council Pastoral of 1905 does not feature in the teaching of the aged Archbishop, and will not be further treated here.

**Pastoral for Lent 1907, by Daniel, Archbishop of Hobart.**<sup>147</sup>

This Pastoral is rich in scriptural language, but the Archbishop, contrary to his practice in past pastorals, has given only one reference for the texts quoted explicitly, and none for those incorporated into his writing. The Pastoral is signed also by his new Coadjutor, Patrick Delany. As the whole format differs from past pastorals, with numbered headings throughout, perhaps the new Bishop was the author of this one. Further support for this idea may be seen in the gap of sixteen years back to the last Murphy pastoral in the set preserved, and the fact that this year of 1907 was the year of the Archbishop's death, on 29 December. The pastoral begins with a heading, and not the usual Scriptural quotation. It then uses headings for each section, as the Plenary Council Pastoral had done. Such had not been Murphy's practice. Because this is almost certainly not his composition, it is presented in summary as Appendix VII.

---

<sup>145</sup> CA 6/DEL 1.

<sup>146</sup> CA 6/mur 31.

<sup>147</sup> CA 6/mur 29.

---

**Appendix II**  
**Summary of Pastorals.**

The years covered by these Pastorals are as follows, with the major concerns summarised:

- |           |   |
|-----------|---|
| 1867      | The purpose of Lent, Easter Duty of Catholics, spreading the Faith to others, the Cathedral debt.   |
| 1868      | God speaks through the Church, prohibition of worship with Protestants, the danger of mixed marriages.  |
| 1868      | Prayers for the Church in Poland and Italy, secret societies, prayers as asked by the Pope, money for his support.  |
| 1869      | Lenten duties, Sabbath observance, shooting of Duke of Edinburgh, bigotry, calm loyalty.  |
| 1869      | Provincial Council Pastoral; Catholic schools, mixed marriages, Aborigines, spread of the Faith.  |
| 1870 [VG] | Vatican I, Council statistics, prayers for the Council, Catholic children taught by Protestants, parents who desert their children.   |
| 1871      | Outrage of Italian nationalism, Pius IX, protests called for, prayers for Pope.   |
| 1871      | Reply from Pius IX to Bishop Murphy, thanks for the support sent.   |
| 1873      | Principles of Christian education, Petition to Parliament, authorities quoted on education, beware being led astray, duties of parents, Church not sectarian.   |
| 1874      | General Church councils, Australian Provincial councils, local synod resolutions, Catholic Association, Christian Brothers, call to lobby MPs, rules for mixed marriage celebration, clergy support, spreading of Faith, Peter's Pence, 2nd Provincial Council Decrees. |
| 1877      | Rebuilding of Cathedral, explanation, appeal.   |
| 1877      | Indian Famine, written in support of the Governor's relief fund.  |
| 1878      | Intemperance, Lenten discipline, Cathedral appeal, death of Pius IX, prayers for him, election of Leo XIII, prayers of rejoicing, Peter's Pence.  |
| 1879      | Modern pagan philosophy, Encyclical of Leo XIII, reason cannot contradict faith, anathemas of   |

- 
- Vatican I, Catholic education prevents these errors, Sunday Schools, Cathedral progress report, call to Lenten regularity.
- 1880 Appeal for the famine sufferers in Ireland, the effects of perjury in the justice system.
- 1881 The Church as sign of marriage, 1877 Encyclical of Leo, indissolubility of marriage, obligations to children, scandalising the young, need for Catholic schools, Cathedral dedication and debt.
- 1882 Ash Wed, fasting, alms-giving, prayer, Confession, Holy Communion, penitential practices, coming trip to Rome, troubles of Pope, administrators of diocese.
- 1883 Mercy and alms deeds, different conditions of people, duty of the rich, sins forgiven, few cannot give, widow's mite, God's generosity, report on trip to Rome, *letter from Rome, Christian Brothers, more Catholic schools, local seminary*, Peter has spoken.
- 1884 Bringing up children, religiously, with correction, moderately, example of parents, immorality of secular schools, need for Catholic schools, duties of Lent.
- 1885 Creation points to the Creator, reason can discover something of God, heresy of the age is reason alone, Leo XIII on Freemasons and Naturalists, leads to attack on Christian education, Freemasonry condemned by Popes, be guided by Church, use Lenten discipline for strength.
- 1891 Christian marriage, Church is guide, marriage a sacrament, mixed marriage militates against, Reformers abolished sacrament, hence growth of divorce, indissolubility of marriage, letter from Pope on African slavery, collection for African missions, notice that he is applying for coadjutor.
- 1905 3rd Prov Council Pastoral:- Growth of Church, Unity of Catholics, confidence in future, Church-State relations, Socialism, public education, the Bible, Catholic press and journals, mixed marriages, charitable and benefit societies.
- 1907 Daily prayer, prayer for the many, feelings and prayer, praying the Our Father.

---

**Appendix III**  
**Examples of Bishop Murphy's Literary Style.**

His pastorals are written in very readable, educated style, and would have been read to congregations, and expounded upon by the priests in language more suited to the largely untutored audience. When read aloud, they have a dignity of delivery that is impressive. They are beautifully tailored to be read, and have a cadence, rhythm, and balance that is obvious, inviting their declamation. Some examples of this follow:-

From Lenten Pastoral, 1869. 148

He then moved on to comment upon the shooting of the Prince of Wales in Sydney. He thanked God for his protection from the storms against the Church that the event had generated, beginning in Sydney, and then engulfing Melbourne and Tasmania. . .

everywhere its course chilling and withering the finer feelings of our nature; rooting up the foundations of charity; destroying long established friendships; and sowing in their stead the seeds of national antipathies and religious rancour. For the crime of one man, who had not a single associate, and who was withall a monomaniac, you were most unjustly assailed by the press, in public meetings, and in private circles; no faith was placed in your professions of loyalty; no credit given to your expressions of sympathy with the Royal sufferer - and this obloquy was cast upon you because you were Irish Catholics. This, we are aware, you felt most keenly, and it is a matter of sincere congratulation and thankfulness to God, that though pained and galled to the quick, you have in no one instance resented the outrages inflicted on your loyalty, your religion, and on all you hold dear. Conscious of your own innocence and confiding in the Divine power, you weathered the storm with a fortitude and dignity worthy of the early Christians; believing that this was but one of those trials sent to purify us, and which, as of yore, the standard of true religion issues with a brighter halo of glory. - The Gentiles (have) raged and the people (have) devised vain things . . . against the Lord and His Christ. . . He that dwelleth in Heaven shall laugh at them : and the Lord shall deride them. And has not this punishment already befallen those who so wrongfully accused you. Fallen from the high positions which they so unworthily held in the State and public estimation, they and their abettors have been laughed to scorn by all right-minded men.

It is possible, Dearly Beloved Brethren, that you may again be subjected to a similar ordeal, but while we remind you that persecution is a mark of the true Church, We have, at the same time, to exhort you to be always calm and dignified under such circumstances, and never allow yourselves to be provoked into a violation of the laws of the State or of God.

From Lenten Pastoral, 1874. 149

Dearly Beloved Brethren. - In accordance with an ancient custom, which has been sanctioned by sacred canons, the Holy Catholic Church has, on numerous occasions, assembled her councils, some general and some particular, but all having the same object in view, vis., the glory of God and the salvation of souls. Composed, as those councils have been, of pastors whom the Holy Ghost placed over His Church, and who were intimately acquainted with the necessities of their flocks, they were provided with that human knowledge, and those supernatural insights that were deemed necessary to carry out the object they had in view. . .

---

148 CA 6/MUR 18, Pastoral for Lent, 1869, by 'the Bishop of Hobart Town.'

149 CA 6/MUR 21A, Pastoral for Lent, 1874, by 'the Bishop of Hobart Town.'

The new and flourishing Church of Australia has already had its councils. Its first Provincial Council is dated September 1844. It was convoked by the Metropolitan, Most Rev. Dr Polding, Archbishop of Sydney, who had, as his associates two bishops, the Most Rev. Dr Willson, Bishop of Hobart Town, and the Most Rev. Dr Murphy, Bishop of Adelaide, the representatives of the only (other) two Sees existing at that time in Australia. The second Council was convoked by that same illustrious Archbishop, and was held in Melbourne in April, 1869. It was attended by the Metropolitan as President, and six bishops of the province, who represented an equal number of dioceses, there being also two other dioceses that were vacant at the time, and had no representative at the Council. . . . the decrees of the first provincial council of Australia, having been duly promulgated in this diocese, it became the duty of our Diocesan Synod, recently held at our Cathedral, Hobart Town, to promulgate, and to devise measures to carry out the decrees of the second Council.

Finally, an example of Murphy teaching his flock in the social and moral issue of perjury, from his Lenten Pastoral, 1880. <sup>150</sup>

They then summarise the section of the Pastoral on perjury: - " . . . His lordship the Bishop calls special attention to the frequency with which blasphemy and perjury are committed, 'than which more heinous sins can hardly be conceived.' 'Truth and justice,' continues the Bishop,

are, dearly beloved brethren, qualities which according to natural as well as divine law should characterise the conduct of man at all times in his relation with both God and his fellow man. They should be his rule of life, and he who follows them is universally esteemed and respected, while he who feels no hesitation in disregarding them is contemned and distrusted. What object more loathed by society than the liar, and what more deserving of indignation than the unjust man. Now if truth and justice are indispensable requisites in the everyday transactions of life, how much more necessary are they not when the most sacred name of God is introduced to attest their presence, or in other words when an oath is taken; for God is truth itself, justice itself. These are attributes which belong to his nature. He is essentially true, essentially just, and cannot be otherwise without forfeiting his claims to a being of infinite perfections and worthy of faith and confidence. Now he who swears falsely or unjustly has the hardihood to invoke the name of God to attest a falsehood or to invoke an injustice, and by thus violating his most sacred rights he commits an offence of a most heinous character. Such a one is a perjurer and a blasphemer. Moreover, in addition to the outrage committed against the Divine majesty, he is also guilty of a grievous wrong to his neighbour by robbing him of the right which belongs to him, of having the truth made known and justice done him, and as far as lies in his power he destroys that good faith and sincerity which form the bond of society. Such, dearly beloved brethren, are the characteristics of perjury and blasphemy, which contain a species of impiety and malice peculiar to themselves, and which justly merit the vengeance of the Almighty. 'A curse shall come to the house of him who sweareth falsely, and shall remain in the midst of his house, and shall consume it' (Zacharias 5. 4). [See Zech 5. 3-4.] 'Let not thy mouth be accustomed to swearing, for in it there are many falls' (Sir 23. 9.) [See Sir 23. 9-10.] 'He that blasphemeth the name of the Lord dying, let him die' Lev 24. 10.)' [See Lev 24. 16.]

---

<sup>150</sup> *The Catholic Standard*, March, 1880.

Communications of this kind should strike terror into the hearts of the most hardened offenders, and should impress all with the necessity of using due caution and discretion (the third condition prescribed by the prophet) when taking a formal oath in a court of justice or elsewhere. They should be prepared to state nothing contrary to truth or justice, no matter how near or dear to them the matters at stake may be.

The Church, solicitous for the honour of its Founder, has legislated on this point, and has shown her horror of this crime by the severe ecclesiastical censures she has passed against it. Nor is the State wanting in its duty in this respect, for it has enacted laws for the punishment of convicted perjurers.

---

**Appendix IV.**  
**From the Second Provincial Council Pastoral, on the Aborigines.**

We have dispossessed the aboriginals of the soil, at least we have deprived them of the use of it from which they gained a subsistence, even if it be not such a use as can properly be considered to constitute a possession. In natural justice, then, we are held to compensation. We are held by all claims of natural pity, by kindness, and justice, to give these poor fellow creatures such protection, and such instruction as would more than counterbalance those wretched means of human subsistence from which they are driven. But why speak of natural justice and compassion only to you who are Christian and Catholics? We know with the certainty of faith that God has made of one, - all mankind, *ex uno omne genus hominum*; that Christ died for all *pro omnibus mortuus est Christus*; and, therefore, that these aboriginals, who seem and who are indeed so low are still our fellow creatures, fallen from the same natural and supernatural gifts of origin, heirs to the same redemption and regeneration through Christ. We know, too, with the certainty of faith, that we who have received the gospel of Christ are bound to communicate it to them. *Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptising them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.* This, then, is what white men should have done; in this light of faith they should have acted towards the black men of this continent. The combined influence and means of the incoming nation, since it professed to be a nation of Christians, should have been applied to protect, and teach, and to make disciples of Christ those poor children of the soil, where they have found new homes and worldly wealth. Alas! It is shocking to think of what has, in fact, been done. With very little, with short-lived exception, injustice, neglect, cruelty, and, a million times worse, the actual teaching of vice, have branded the annals of white men. The stain of blood is upon us - blood has been shed far otherwise than in self-defence - blood, in needless and wanton cruelty. It is said, even now, that as Europeans progress northwards, blood is so shed. Shall we not protest against this? Bishops and priests, all ministers and disciples of Christ, shall they not protest by word and deed?

We do so protest, dearly beloved; and whilst we do protest, we acknowledge gratefully the solicitude repeatedly expressed by Her Majesty's Government that efforts should be made to ameliorate the condition of the Aborigines - that they should be protected and provided for so far as may be necessary - we acknowledge that this solicitude has been accepted by the Colonial Authorities; we bear willing testimony that very many of our fellow colonists have exhibited a truly humane Christian spirit in their relations with them; others, however, have, in justification of a great crime, striven to believe that these black men are not of our race, are not our fellow creatures. We Catholics know assuredly how false this is; we know that one soul of theirs is, like one of our own, of more worth than the whole material world, that any human soul is of more worth, as it is of greater cost, than the whole mere matter of this earth, its sun and its system, or, indeed, of all the glories of the firmament. And this is one of those truths of faith which indifferentism denies, and obscures, we fear, also in the minds of too many Catholics. We are bound to proclaim it and enforce, as we do most solemnly. By what means the Christian regeneration of the aboriginals may be best attempted we can scarcely yet determine in detail, until European conscience and humanity are a little more fully awake. The duty is harder than it was, because European vice and disease have been added to the original evil of savage corruption. In place of bearing with them the exorcism and life of Christian faith and baptism, white men have too often been apostles of Satan, have riveted his chains, and confirmed his kingdom. It seems now almost a

---

necessary condition that Christian missionaries should isolate themselves and their disciples from all intercourse with white men. We want missionaries equal to the glorious exile of those members of the Society of Jesus, who preached and taught the Gospel of old in the reductions of Paraguay, and perhaps, this country will never be fully purified and absolved, until such men shall have arisen within it. May God speed the time, if indeed it be in store for us! Still, some little has been done, enough to show how utterly false is the assertion, that our aboriginals are irreclaimable, are of so low a type of humanity, that they have absolutely no faculties to receive moral and spiritual truth. What has been accomplished on our western coast by the Spanish Benedictines proves abundantly that a little patience, and the perseverance of charity and faith, can prepare their souls to receive the grace of Christ. What is wanting is, not capacity in the aboriginals, but apostolic self-devotion in the followers of Christ. The sad truth is, that the neighbourhood of white men, instead of being the proof and illustration of Christianity is a scandal and an antichrist. The Fathers of this Council are at this moment powerless; they have neither men nor means at command; but they desire solemnly to lay upon the conscience of all who have property in these colonies the thought that there is blood upon their land, and that human souls, to whom they are in so many ways debtors, in the name of natural justice, and in the name of the Redeemer, are perishing because no man careth for them. It is a thought not for the clergy alone, but for the whole Church, laity and clergy too. No one of us must dare to say with Cain the murderer, 'Am I my brother's keeper?'



---

Appendix V.  
A Description of the Opening of Vatican I from the  
Vicar-General's Pastoral, 1870.

It is known to you all that Œcumenical Council is at present assembled at Rome, convoked for the purpose of deliberating upon the most momentous matters that could possibly engage the attention of the human mind, and decreeing what is most conducive to the common welfare of the entire Christian world, and to the peace, happiness and greater glory of the Church; but the surpassing splendour and magnificence of the opening of that Council may be unknown to most of you. I shall, therefore, present you with the most authentic account of that wonderful event, which has come to hand, taken mostly from the *Westminster Gazette* and partly from the *Tablet*, in order to induce you to raise your hearts to Heaven in thanksgiving to God for having inaugurated 'The First Council of the Vatican' under such auspicious circumstances. So magnificent, indeed, was the opening of that Council that it is written of it that one felt one was in the centre of everything grandest and sublimest in Heaven and earth fraught with a sense of the proximity of one's dear ones gone before, who surely, if anywhere, must have been there too.

The 8th December, 1869 - a day sacred to the Immaculate Conception of the ever glorious Mary Mother of God - was fixed upon for the opening of the Œcumenical Council, but 'the eve of that great festival is the date from which anything like a detailed description of the Council must begin.

He then gives a description of the events leading up to the great opening, taken from the London papers he has already referred to.

On the morning of the 7th of December, every altar in Rome was crowded with communicants for the intentions of the Pope, thousands of people choosing that day to fulfil their jubilee. From daybreak, the masses went on without interruption till nearly one, alike in parochial and conventual churches, an immense number being celebrated by the foreign clergy and Bishops within reach. The vigil was observed as a strict fast, many of the more devout Roman families keeping it on bread and water in the primitive fashion. At Midday the batteries of S. Angelo, and the belfries of Rome simultaneously announced that the day was come, which had been so long and so ardently desired by the lovers of the Church and feared by her enemies, which was set for the resurrection of many, and by God's mercy we may hope for the fall of none; which to the separated churches is a loving call to

Unthread the rude eye of rebellion,

And welcome back the discarded Faith,

and which to every living Catholic is a message of hope, of courage, of united action for the latest and most deadly struggle the Church may perhaps be engaged in.

On the 8th December, the greatest day the Eternal City ever saw, all Rome was awake and abroad before the first break of daylight; before the brazen tongues of the campanili had begun to stir the air, before the mortars of the Angels' Fort had begun to call on their fellows of Mount Aventine to announce the gathering of the Lord's people.

The Pastoral goes on to describe the opening of the Council. It records the order of the procession into St Peter's and the numbers of Council Fathers in attendance.

**The Episcopate of Daniel Murphy - First Archbishop of Hobart**  
**90**

---

Cardinals	51
Patriarchs	9
Primates, Archbishops, Bishops, and Abbots General	653
Mitred Abbots	2
Generals of Orders	28
Total	743

---

**Appendix VI.**

**Pastoral of the Third Plenary Council, 1905.**

The Council Fathers, twenty-three in all, begin assembled at the call of the "Chief Pastor of the Church . . . we deem it our duty before separating to address to you some words of encouragement and exhortation." They then proceed through the pastoral, using headings for each section.

**Growth of the Church in Australia.**

They give praise to "the Father of Mercies for the favours He has abundantly showered on Australia, especially during the ten years that have elapsed since the Second Plenary Council was celebrated. The period has been one of quiet growth and consolidation, . . . our Catholic population (in Australasia) has grown to . . . 1,011,550. The Clergy number over 1300; the teaching Brothers over 600; the Nuns over 5,500. We maintain 33 colleges for boys, and 169 boarding schools for girls; 215 superior day schools; 1087 primary schools; 94 charitable institutions; and the children in Catholic schools number over 127,000. . . . a land that has grown with the rapidity of adolescence, the Church has progressed also, even so as to keep well to the front among the most progressive institutions of the country."

**SINGULAR UNITY OF AUSTRALIAN CATHOLICS.**

" . . . we must thank Him particularly for two blessings which . . . have been used by the Almighty to promote the Faith in Australia. . . . the singular unity with which we Bishops are united with one another and with our Priests and people, and the uncompromising spirit of Faith which has filled and sustained the heart of Catholic Australia in its hard and costly struggle for the religious education of the children."

They then go on to justify the "singular unity" claim. " . . . now, for the third time within a period of twenty years, the Bishops of all this vast Commonwealth have harmoniously deliberated in Plenary Council, " and to pray that it continue.

**ZEAL FOR CATHOLIC EDUCATION.**

"Australian Catholics have . . . been true to the instincts of the Faith in . . . the education of their children. . . . not been beguiled by . . . statesmen, nor discouraged by the weakness of non-Catholic fellow Christians; . . . they have refused the free gifts of the State, . . . they have won the admiration of all . . . capable of admiring self-sacrifice. . . . they have brought God's blessing on themselves and on all their religious undertakings."

**CONFIDENCE INSPIRED BY THE CHURCH'S POSITION.**

When we consider the position of the Catholic Church at the beginning of the twentieth century of her existence, and especially . . . during the past hundred years, or faith in her is comforted by manifest proofs that the guiding providence of God is directing her steps, and that the promise of her Divine Founder is in the course of fulfilment: 'The gates of hell shall not prevail against her.' (Matt 16. 18.)

**Relations of the Church and State in Australia.**

"In our own land the Church enjoys a liberty which she fully appreciates. She can . . . go back to her early days, ere yet the sun of liberty had risen on Catholics of the British Empire, and recall cruel attempts to transplant . . . the thralldom of religious ascendancy, which had 'in dark and evil days,' cast its blighting shadow over . . . a brave and generous people. . . . failure attended the attempt. Australia may rightly claim that she is a land of liberty, and Australian Catholics, . . . largely the

---

descendants of the martyr-nation of liberty, not likely to prize their freedom lightly, nor to be backward . . . in defending it."

"The Church . . . is free from any direct civil disability ; and towards the throne of His Imperial Majesty, and the persons of the Governors, . . . is loyally affected in every dutiful manner." They go on to state that Catholics feel pain as Empire law requires the monarch to insult their religion "when coming to his throne," and they hope that the Anti Catholic declaration in the Coronation Oath will be removed. They mention the development of democracy "in all the civilised nations."

#### The Catholic Church and Socialism.

The Fathers of the Council remark that "Socialism" is a word that has been in frequent use in Australia, "especially on political platforms, where . . . it has been made to mean things very widely apart. Some "acknowledge socialism as the name of the economic principles by which those are influenced and guided who seek to redress the wrongs and to alleviate the miseries of the labouring poor. It is beyond question that a large majority of the very poor are heavily pressed by misery and wretchedness which render their lot intolerable; and this deplorable evil is most acute in those countries where the causes producing it are most active."

#### The Church and Public Education.

They complain of the infringement of Catholics' civil liberties in Australia.

#### The Catholic Church and the Bible.

The Fathers comment on "the opposition of 'modern thought' and popular literature to Christianity and to God. They say this stemmed from "the days of Voltaire and the Encyclopædists." Because of the spread of literacy, and the "ready zeal of the Church's enemies to supply cheap reading matter, great havoc has been wrought with the faith of Christians, especially outside the Catholic Church." But the Church has not been "engulphed (sic) by the waves," but has been "carried on their surface . . . fitly typified by the Ark of Noe . . ."

They continue, "In the revolt of modern rationalism against dogmatic revealed religion, the fiercest attacks of the enemies has been against the Bible" which they would "deprive of its sacred character and traditional honour among Christians, by contending that it . . . cannot . . . be accepted as the word of God."

They argue "It is well known that the section of Christianity called Protestant has made the Bible the full and sole rule of its belief, and thus, if the contention(s) of rationalism were well founded, Christianity, as represented by Protestantism would be doomed . . . And, indeed, every serious student must be filled with grave misgivings for the future of Protestantism as a religious system when he finds its authorised ministers in no small number adopting the views of Rationalists on the Bible."

They point out that Catholics have "no such fear. For the depository of his dogmas and the rule of his belief is not the sacred text of scripture, but a living society - a society constituted before one page of the New Testament was written, and guided in every moment of its existence by the same Holy Spirit who inspired both the prophets and evangelists."

#### Popular Catholic Literature.

They comment again on the increased literacy skills that "leave few among our people who do not read." They recognise that "a quick commercial instinct" provides "cheap reading in books" and other forms of literature. But commerce aims "to suit the tastes of millions"

who,"run chiefly in their reading after diversion and frivolity."

#### Catholic Truth Society.

They welcome the arrival of this to Australia. They need 10,000 subscribers at 5/- each to fund the operation, and suggest that each parish could find one subscriber for each 100 people, the annual income of £2,000 would be reached.

#### Parochial libraries.

"The establishment and maintenance of a library in every parish was most urgently recommended . . . by the Bishops in the Second Plenary Council; we would again exhort all to . . . this most useful work."

#### The Press.

"The help to religion that we may expect from the newspaper press is no small one in these days of ubiquitous journalism." They declare that few people now have time to read more than their "penny papers." They then emphasise: "It is then a matter of much consequence that correct news concerning religious affairs should be found in the Press." They state that the secular press has vastly improved lately in reporting Catholic affairs, but much remains to be done. They look for "a perfectly impartial spirit." The laity is best placed to influence "journalistic management," and are urged to do so.

#### Catholic Newspapers.

"Towards that section of the press which is Catholic in purpose and management, all Catholics owe a duty of support and encouragement." The expensive production of such papers depends upon their readers. Some Catholics spend their money on "periodicals that are positively hostile to religion," and these are a danger to children who may see them in the home.

#### Catholic home life.

Home life is paramount in training children and no teacher or pastor can remedy a poor upbringing. "The home is the child's first school, its mother is its first teacher; and first impressions last the longest." Even after infancy, "the influence of home is more potent in a child's training than any other, . . . Here is the woman's place of proper pride and useful power; this is the domain of her rights and the field of her blessedness."

#### Marriage.

"The fountain and starting point of the Christian home is the Christian marriage," and they declare the dignity and purpose of the sacrament. Mixed marriages are deplored, and unions in the faith lauded.

#### Influence of Companionship and Reading.

Parents are urged to beware of bad companions in their children's lives. Reading too is a source of danger if not supervised. Nor should there be pagan pictures in the home.

#### Religious Charitable and Benefit Societies.

The Church blesses and fosters many societies of the faithful. These are ranked as first, confraternities and sodalities, second, associations of charity, and third, Catholic benefit societies. These are a source of blessing and benefit to the individual and to the Church. Pastors are urged to establish and to maintain regularity in these societies.

Conclusion.

They quote 1 Cor 16. 13, "Watch ye, stand fast in the faith, do manfully and be strengthened. Let all your things be done in charity." They renew the dedication of Australia to Mary, Help of Christians, "which the Fathers of the First Council of the Australian Province in 1844 decreed."

---

**Appendix VII.**

**PASTORAL INSTRUCTION ON DAILY PRAYER, 1907.**

**I The Christian Character.**

Christ "has instructed us that we ought to pray always; St Paul exhorts us to pray without ceasing;" also that our conversation should be in heaven; and Abraham was ordered to walk before God and to be perfect.

**II The Christian Character Secured by Prayer.**

He poses the question as to how we do this? Now he draws the lessons from the Scripture passages alluded to.

**III The Christian Character may be lost.**

"And this is the great peril of the Christian; . . . If he cast away this sovereign gift of God, he renders himself an apostate," and he quotes Heb 6. 4-6 "It is impossible for those who were once illuminated . . . to be renewed again to penance, crucifying again to themselves the Son of God, making him a mockery."

**IV How to Preserve the Faith.**

This is a duty towards our own faith and that of others. He quotes Christ's command "Keep the commandments." But faith it is that enables us to do this. Without His grace, we can do nothing.

**V Prayer Manifold.**

"Prayer is manifold in its modes of exercise." He enumerates types of prayer. ". . . the prayer of the soul, when every faculty seems lost or stilled. . . ." This is rare but all great saints have displayed it. ". . . a lower degree of contemplation, . . . which is not so restricted, . . . nourished by special outpourings of the Holy Ghost, . . . comes at times, and then is perhaps missed for long periods . . ." These periods are often ones of anguish of spirit. "It is usually the period of internal progress towards the light. That is the time to rest resolutely upon the root of faith." Most Christians who strive for "cleanness of heart" experience such prayer.

**VI A Simple Prayer Suited for the Many.**

There are "thousands unskilled in the approved methods of mental prayer or meditation for the tens who are." These thousands have the same faith through baptism; they are called in the same hope; it is his duty to instruct them, in a simple method which will lead to "the heights of contemplation." The Lord himself taught this.

**VII Morning Prayer for the Many.**

He begins with the request of the disciples for Jesus to teach them to pray. He recounts this and points out the brevity and the comprehensiveness of the Lord's Prayer, as it fulfils the needs of the Christian in each phrase.

**VIII We must not be Discouraged on Account of Absence of Devotion or because of Distraction.**

The first great duty of the day is "to salute reverently our Creator." We depend entirely upon God.

**IX Feelings of Devotion not Necessary.**

Firstly he says ". . . we are not commanded to put feeling into our prayer. Feeling, or, as it is so wrongly thought, devotion, is not commanded. True devotion is not feeling; it is quite compatible with an utter dryness of heart."

X The "Our Father."

"... let us consider the 'Our Father' our greatest prayer. Remember that our Lord anticipates most of our difficulties herein. The prayer itself is very short. It may be spoken with reverence and attention to what we say, and above all to whom we say it, in less than one minute. And our Lord does not command us to repeat it. ... indeed he says expressly that there is some danger in long prayers, the danger of falling into the view which made the heathens pray long prayers. ..."

XI How to say the "Our Father."

"We then at morning, before going forth to the day's occupations with their countless distractions and many dangers, we go on our knees, if possible; we pause for a few seconds to bring well before our minds the fact that we are about to adore God at the beginning of a new day. And we bless ourselves ... signing ourselves with the sign of our redemption, and then attentively and distinctly, our minds on the sense of the words that we utter, we say to our Creator and Father: 'Our father ... but deliver us from evil. Amen.' Slowly enough to allow the mind to attend to what we are saying to God.

XII The fruits of one 'Our Father' well said.

"What would happen if they were faithful to this short reverent prayer at morn and even? ... God's grace and providence would have full scope over their every hour. He would give them abundantly ... their daily bread. ... supply the needs of this life and the life to come; ... surround their going out and their coming in. ... His angels would lift them up ... unless they should dash themselves against any harm. He would make temptation issue for their safety. He would intervene ... in ... trials that might go hard with them. For God is always faithful to His promises."

XIII Brief Explanation of the 'Our Father.'

"Let us go over the petitions or wishes we address to God in the 'Our Father.'

XIV The "Hail Mary" and the "I believe in God."

"... Of course all those who really habituate themselves to prayer will often feel impelled ... to burst forth in variations ... of the essential forms of the 'Our Father.' The Bible is full of (such prayers.) ... " He summarises the purpose of the Pastoral, and continues:

"But if we do this much, we will do more. ... He Himself will enlarge our hearts. From prayer we will go to the Sacraments and we will hunger and thirst after justice under every form in which the Spirit of God presents it."

He closes with his usual 2 Cor 13. 13, without referencing it.

+ Daniel,  
Archbishop of Hobart.  
+ Patrick,  
Bishop of Laranda and Coadjutor Bishop of Hobart.



## SOURCES

### From the Archives of the Archdiocese of Hobart

The Cullen Papers

The Murphy Papers

The Delany Papers

### Presentation Sisters Archives, Woodburn, Blackmans Bay,

the following:-

Selected documents on:

Mother Xavier Murphy, Bk 1;

Mother Xavier Murphy, Bk 11;

1866-1867;

1868-1869;

1870-1872;

Records of Community members of Tasmanian Presentation Sisters, Nos 1 - 36.

### Other sources.

#### Newspapers.

*The Tasmanian Catholic Standard*, July 1867 - June, 1872.

*The Tasmanian Catholic Herald*, August, 1872 - July, 1873.

*The Tasmanian Catholic Standard*, November, 1876 - January, 1878.

*The Tasmanian Catholic Standard*, from February, 1878.

*The Catholic Standard*,. from February 1878.

*The Standard*,. 1938

*The Catholic Press*,. 1903.

A Tasmanian Catholic paper, not named or dated, an obituary.

*The Mercury*, 1866-1908.

---

BIBLIOGRAPHY

'Report of the Royal Society of Tasmania' published in *Papers and Proceedings of the Royal Society of Tasmania*, 1891-93.

*Australian Dictionary of Biography*, Vol 5:1851-90, Section Editors Bede Nairn, et al, MUP, Melbourne, 1974.

Beechinor, MJ, ['Father Michael'], *Memoir of Archbishop Murphy*, Tabart Bros, Launceston, 1916.

Campion, Edmund, *Rockchoppers*, Penguin Books, Melbourne, Vic, 1982.

Chadwick, Owen, *The Secularisation of the European Mind*, CUP, Cambridge, UK, 1985.

Cullen, JH, 1866-1966 *A brief History to Commemorate the Centenary of the Sisters of the Presentation of the Blessed Virgin Mary in Tasmania*, Foot & Playsted, Printers, Launceston, 1966.

O'Farrell, Patrick, *The Catholic Church and Community*, NSWU Press, Kensington, NSW, 1985.

O'Farrell, Patrick, *The Irish in Australia*, NSWU Press, Kensington, NSW, Rev Ed 1993.

Southerwood, WT, *Lonely Shepherd in Van Diemen's Isle*, Stella Maris Books, Georgetown, Tas, 1988.

Southerwood, WT, *The Convicts Friend*, Stella Maris Books, Georgetown, Tas, 1989.

Southerwood, WT, *Time-Line of Catholic Australia*, Stella Maris Books, Sandy Bay, Tas, 1993.

Warne, Susan Lyall, *Sectarianism in Hobart: The Chiniquy Disturbances of 1879*, unpublished BA (Hons) thesis, University of Tasmania, 1977.